THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE CHARACTER OF THE GREEK OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL

PARALLELS TO THE "ARAMAISMS" OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL FROM EPICTETUS AND THE PAPYRI

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF NEW TESTAMENT AND

EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

BY

ERNEST CADMAN COLWELL

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

JUNE, 1930

Blank!

INTRODUCTION

The hypothesis of an Aramaic original for the Gospel of John is no recent deduction; Burney notes[1] three scholars who suggested it before the nineteenth century: C.Salmasius[2], I.A.Bolton[3], and H.F.Pfannkuche[4]. At the beginning of the nineteenth century the idea was elaborated by L.Berthold[5], but no extensive development of the theory is found until the beginning of this century.

At that time A.Schlatter[6] paralleled many verses throughout Jn with material found in the new Hebrew of Mechilta, Sifre, and other Rabbinic commentaries; the extent to which this could be done convincing him that the Gospel of John was written by one who thought and spoke in Aramaic. About the same time, Dalman was expressing the opinion that the evidence was not sufficient to show the existence of a written gospel in Aramaic, and that the Fourth Gospel was decidedly less Aramaic than the Synoptists[7]. Wellhausen supported the latter conclusion, holding that the Greek of John

---

1 The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel, p.2, note.
2 De Hellenistica Commentarius, 1645.
3 Der Bericht des Joannes von Jesu dem Messias übersetzt, 1797.
4 Ueber die palastinische Landessprache in dem Zeitalter Christi, in Eichhorn's Allgem. Bibl. d. b. Litt. VIII, 1797.
5 Verosimilia de origine evangelii Joannis, 1805.
6 Die Sprache und Heimat des vierten Evangelisten, Gütersloh 1902.
7 The Words of Jesus, Edinburgh 1902.

differs from that of Mark in that it is no "verkleidetes Aramäisch"[8]. But the next year the plea for a written Aramaic original was advanced by C.J.Ball in a study of some peculiarities in the language of the Fourth Gospel[9].

This article stimulated the late C.F.Burney to a study of the language of Jn which resulted in the most comprehensive argument for an Aramaic original that has appeared up to the present time[10]. It contains a preliminary testing of the theory by examination of the Prologue, which is "retranslated into Aramaic; a discussion of Aramaisms in sentence structure, and in the use of conjunctions, pronouns, verbs, and negatives; a series of mistranslations of the original Aramaic of the Gospel; an argument that the O.T. quotations were originally made in Hebrew; and an Appendix which reconsiders authorship, place of writing, date, etc., in the light of the Aramaic original. It insists on the "clear distinction between Aramaisms and Hebraisms"[11], but nevertheless uses Hebraisms as an argument for the Aramaic original[12].

In his linguistic argument, Burney assumes that the Synoptic gospels are standard Koine Greek. Aramaisms in Jn are, for the most part, detected by a quantitative comparison

---

8 Das Evangelium Johannis, Berlin 1908, p.145.
9 "Had the Fourth Gospel an Aramaic Archetype?", Expository Times, Nov. 1909.
10 The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel, Oxford 1922.
11 Ibid, p.7f.
12 cf. e.g., Ibid, p.(96.

of the usage of Jn with them; the relative frequency or infrequency of Synoptic usage in Jn indicating the Aramaism. The establishment of mistranslations he regards as essential to his argument, and claims that his mistranslations are demanded by difficulties and peculiarities of language.

At the same time that Burney was working out his theory, James A. Montgomery was independently arriving at a similar conclusion. In his short study of the origin of Jn[13] he discusses geographical and historical data, data bearing on Jewish institutions, the Aramaic background of the Gospel, and its theology. His argument for the Aramaic background does not demand a written Aramaic original; nor does he, ordinarily establish the Aramaism by contrasting Jn with the Synoptists: he notes, rather, those cases which seem to him to represent Aramaic constructions. The demonstration of mistranslations is not, therefore, necessary to his thesis; and he prefaces his list of "possible" evidences for an Aramaic original with a word of caution which calls attention to this fact.

The various reviews and discussions of these works will be referred to in the course of this study and in the Conclusion, but one article deserves mention here. Professor C.C.Torrey in an article in the Harvard Theological Review[14] summarizes previous pleas for an Aramaic original of Jn and

---

13 J.A.Montgomery, The Origin of the Gospel According to St. John, Philadelphia 1923.

14 "The Aramaic Origin of the Gospel of John", Harvard Theological Review XVI (1923) 305-344.

carries the argument on. He confesses that the main body of Burney's work seems convincing to him although he rejects the mistranslations for which Burney argues, almost without exception, and is willing to admit Hellenistic influence in the "Logos" and the mysticism of the Fourth Gospel. His contribution lies in suggesting the Aramaic nature of several Johannine constructions to which attention had been called by Wellhausen and in supplying a new set of mistranslations to replace those of Burney which he has rejected. His endorsement of Burney's main argument is remarkable in view of the fact that he regards the Synoptic gospels as retaining more traces of Semitic origin and influence than Jn, whereas Burney's argument rests largely upon establishing Johannine usage as a contrast to Synoptic usage.

The present study is based upon the last three works, and upon the work of Professor Burney in particular.. J.H. Moulton's decision that "The over-use of locutions which can be defended as good Koine Greek" is an evidence of Semitic influence[15] has been taken up by Burney and is fundamental to his method. That is to say, he sees in the frequency in Jn of a construction which is not frequent in Greek but is frequent in Aramaic an evidence of the Aramaic original. Not a word can be said against this in theory; in its application the all-important thing is the selection of the basis for normal use and the determination of possible variation within

---

15 Cambridge Biblical Essays, p.474, quoted in AOFG, p.7,57; cf. W.E.Barnes, JTS XXIII (1922) 419.

this normal Greek usage. This basis Burney finds in Synoptic usage, and he regards it as so normative that at times only a slight variation from it is used as evidence for an "Aramaism" in Jn. Yet on other occasions the agreement of Jn with Mk is regarded as a strong argument for the Aramaic original of Jn, since Mk is the work "of a Palestinian Jew who either actually wrote in Aramaic, or whose mind was so moulded by Aramaic idiom that his Greek perforce reflected it."[16] It would seem then that where Mk agrees with Jn, it is Aramaic; where it differs from Jn, it is Greek, or, perhaps, Hebraistic. Lk is the "most Hebraic gospel of the four"[17]; and Mt is either directly or through his sources influenced by Aramaic[18]. If the Synoptic gospels are so Semitic, it would seem that they make an unsatisfactory standard by which to measure the language of Jn.

To secure a contemporary, neutral, non-Semitic control for Johannine usage, the author of the present study has turned to the papyri of the Roman period and the Discourses of Epictetus. The Discourses were included in this study as being one of the least Semitic of Jn's contemporaries; for, though N.T. constructions in the papyri have been explained as due to the influence of the Jewish language upon the Egyptian Koine, no such influence upon Epictetus has yet been predicated. But it should not be inferred that the writings of Epictetus and the papyri have been regarded as furnishing a fixed standard for Hellenistic Greek usage from which there

---

16 AOFG, p.17. 17 AOFG, p.9. 18 AOFG, p.8, note.

is no deviation; the wide variation in the usage of individual writers among the Greeks is a factor which must be taken into consideration in any study of this sort.

The method employed has been to make a list of the constructions in Jn which Burney, Montgomery, or Torrey regarded as Aramaisms, and to look for these same constructions in the papyri and the Discourses. Since there is little duplication in the three lists of Aramaisms, it was felt necessary to limit the study to some extent. As the most easily detached parts of Burney's work are the preliminary study of the Prologue, and the argument on the original language of the O.T. quotations, these have not been dealt with, as such, in this work. Yet many of the passages in the Prologue which Burney recognized as Aramaisms have been discussed under the head of mistranslations or in connection with similar constructions elsewhere in the Gospel.

In regard to each construction the alleged Aramaic nature is first pointed out; then the parallels in Greek usage, especially in Epictetus and the papyri, are either quoted or referred to. In some cases, examples of classical usage, or of Modern Greek usage,are given; occasionally, the restored Aramaic is attacked, usually through the opinions of others. But such features are relatively unimportant; the question that this study attempts to answer is: Granted that the construction mentioned is the equivalent of a Semitic construction, do parallels exist in contemporary Greek usage as that is found in Epictetus and the papyri? An answer to

this question should be of value in attempting to answer the larger question as to whether or not the Gospel of John was originally written in Aramaic.

No confidence is felt that the evidence of either the Discourses or the papyri has been presented in anything approaching exhaustive fashion. The number of locutions involved, as well as the extent of the field covered, makes it certain that many another parallel besides those listed here may be drawn from the Discourses and the papyri that have been studied, as also from the large number of published papyri which have not been used in this connection.

But the author feels more apologetic for his occasional use of statistics and approximate totals than for the incompleteness of their presentation. Where they are used, it is not from any undue confidence in the power of figures to settle linguistic disputes, but to meet the figures presented by Dr. Burney. Nowhere are statistics more misleading than in the attempt to reduce to order the wide variety of Greek usage; and the figures presented here, will, it is hoped, discourage future attempts to find large significance in small variation.

An attempt has been made to use the material to be found in comments on Burney's work. The author regrets that he has not yet secured a copy of G.R.Driver's review[19] and so has been forced to rely on MH's use of it.[20]

---

19 "The Original Language of the Fourth Gospel", Jewish Guardian, Jan. 5,12, 1923.

20 Abbreviations are explained in the Bibliography.

CHAPTER I

SEMITIC IDIOMS IN SENTENCE STRUCTURE

1. Asyndeton

The frequency of asyndeton in Aramaic as opposed to Hebrew leads Burney to the conclusion that the frequency of asyndeton in Jn is an evidence of its Aramaic origin[1]. In Jn 1, neglecting openings in speeches, he finds 34 asyndeton as against 28 connected sentences.[2] To sustain his argument, he takes two other chapters: chapter 11, containing 59 sentences with 17 asyndeton; chapter 18, containing 52 sentences, 20 asyndeton. This proportion, he points out, is very high as compared with the Synoptics: Mt 3 contains 13 sentences, no asyndeton; Lk 8 contains 60 sentences, 2 asyndeton; Mk 1 contains 38 sentences, 2 asyndeton.

There is no other phase of linguistic argument where figures are less significant than they are in this case. In the first place, the unit of measurement is an elusive quantity; it has been impossible to count the instances of asyndeton in Jn 1 so as to get figures that would agree with Burney's. If independent, co-ordinate clauses are counted as sentences, the proportion of asyndeton perceptibly decreases;

---

1 AOFG, p.50f.

2 In this connection he points out that "and", the most frequent connective particle here, is the ordinary Semitic connective particle.

Burney himself notes in regard to the Prologue "its fondness for co-ordination of sentences linked by καί."[3] However, it is undeniably true that asyndeton is much more common in Jn than in the first three gospels. Does this differentiate Jn from Hellenistic Greek?

In a count of syndeton and asyndeton sentences in approximately 200 papyri of the Roman period, twenty-two were found with no syndeton sentences at all. Several of these consist of only two sentences, but one, P Fay 117 (Letter 108 AD), contains eight asyndeton sentences; another, P Oxy III 466 (Directions for Wrestling ii AD), although it consists almost entirely of imperatives, contains thirteen. There are many more in which unconnected sentences far outnumber connected sentences; e.g., P Oxy I 113 (Letter ii AD) 10 asyndeton, 1 syndeton; P Lond II 265 (Instructions for converting Artabae i AD) 91 asyndeton, 25 syndeton. On the other hand, similar examples might be cited for the prevalence of connected sentences in the papyri; for here, as in many another instance, there is wide variation in Greek usage.

In the Discourses of Epictetus, a count of asyndeton and syndeton sentences is rather difficult. The frequency of fragmentary sentences and the rapid dialogue make it difficult to secure definite and exact results. In a count of I 14 to I 24, 270 asyndeton sentences were found to 307 syndeton. The wide revision which a check of this count might demand could

---

3 AOFG, p.40.

hardly alter the proportion to one that would be closer to that of the Synoptic Gospels than to Jn.

But the most convincing proof of the naturalness of asyndeton in Greek is seen in such passages from Epictetus as the following:

I 18.13f. ἔχεις καλὰ ἱμάτια, ὁ γείτων σου οὐκ ἔχει· θυρίδα ἔχεις, θέλεις αὐτὰ ψῦξαι οὐκ οἶδεν ἐκεῖνος τί τὸ ἀγαθόν ἐστι τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἀλλὰ φαντάζεται ὅτι τὸ ἔχειν καλὰ ἱμάτια, κτλ.

I 19.24 Ἠξίωται δημαρχίας. πάντες οἱ ἀπαντῶντες συνήδονται· ἄλλος τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς καταφιλεῖ, ἄλλος τὸν τράχηλον, οἱ δοῦλοι τὰς χεῖρας. ἔρχεται εἰς οἶκον, εὑρίσκει λύχνους ἁπτομένους. ἀναβαίνει εἰς τὸ καπιτώλιον, ἐπιθύει.

The succession of unconnected sentences found in these and many similar passages in the Diatribes goes far beyond the asyndeton of Jn. In the proportion of asyndeton to syndeton sentences, Jn stands with Epictetus apart from the Synoptics. W.E.Barnes, who quotes in this connection the opening of Tacitus' Annals, is stating the case conservatively when he says, "Asyndeton is far too common a feature of language in general to bear the stress which Dr. Burney lays upon it."[4]

1a. Asyndeton with ἀποκρίνομαι

This construction occurs 65 times in Jn, as against 11 uses of the same verb with connectives, and is found only once outside Jn in the N.T. Burney regards this as due to

---

4 JTS, XXIII (1922) 419.

the asyndeton use of "answered" in Aramaic.[5] His argument runs as follows: 28 instances of "answer" used asyndeton are found in the six Aramaic chapters of Daniel, against 2 cases in which "then" is used as connective. The syndeton use is the rule in Hebrew. Theodotion's version represents ענה by ἀποκρίνομαι 12 times, preserving the asyndeton 4 times. In 38 passages in Jn, ἀποκρίνομαι introduces the words spoken without further verb; in the 26 other Johannine cases, καὶ εἶπεν is added. "It is difficult to resist the conclusion that ἀπεκρίθη καὶ εἶπεν is a literal rendering of the Aramaic ענה ואמר and ἀπεκρίθησαν καὶ εἶπαν of ענו ואמרין for which, as we have seen, they stand in Theodotion's Daniel."[6]

But MH[7] has adequately pointed out the implications of Burney's "remarkable" conclusion:

> In other words, the first three evangelists have modelled themselves on the familiar language of the LXX, whereas John in 26 passages follows the example of the Aramaic part of Daniel, and in the remaining 38 passages uses the ordinary Hellenistic word, betraying his Aramaic cast of thought only by asyndeton.

Theodotion's evidence is capable of quite another emphasis than that given by Burney. In the first place, he omits the ענה sixteen times. In the next place, he uses it

---

5 AOFG, p.52f.

6 AOFG, p.54. A remarkable inconsistency in Burney's argument is to be seen in the fact that on the page following the claim that ἀπεκρίθησαν καὶ εἶπον is a "literal rendering of the Aramaic ענה ואמר he notes with tacit approval Dalman's statement that this Aramaic phrase, so popular in Daniel, "is unknown in later Jewish Aramaic"(AOFG, p.55, note).

7 Grammar II iii. p.454

without εἶπεν only once. Of the twelve asyndeton passages in which he translates אמר eight are made syndeton in his Greek. That is to say, if frequency of asyndeton use of ἀποκρίνομαιwere used as a test of Greek translated from Aramaic, Theodotion's translation of the Aramaic would give a negative result! The worthlessness of this test for an Aramaic original has been indicated further by Bernard, who points out that it "is common in the LXX, where the original is Hebrew (not Aramaic),e.g. I Sam.14:28;19:22; II Chron.29:31; 34:15; Joel 2:19 (of Jahweh)."[8] The use of ἀποκρίνομαι in Jn is rather to be attributed to that imitation of the LXX which Burney regarded as responsible for the syndeton use in the Synoptics, or even to the evangelists knowledge of the usage in the Synoptic Gospels themselves. And the fact that it is used without connectives needs no Aramaic idiom to support it.

1b. Asyndeton with λέγω

This usage so common in Jn (70 times as against syndeton λέγω 31 times) is very rare in the Synoptic Gospels (Mt 16, Mk 1, Lk 2).[9] It is regarded by Burney as a translation of the asyndeton אמר participle, which, though not found in Daniel, was yet common in Aramaic in Jn's day, especially in its Eastern branch. His parallel to Johannine usage is taken from the Syriac Acts of Thomas, where the

---

8 St. John, p.65. 9 AOFG, p.54f.

"striking resemblance in structure between the two passages... is no mere chance and isolated phenomenon."[10]

Epictetus can show no passage quite as close to Jn's usage as that cited by Burney, nor does he use λέγω asyndeton in quite as large a proportion as Jn does. From I 19 to II 15, λέγω appears without a connective 44 times and with a connective 40 times, but this is much closer to Jn than to the Synoptic Gospels. The proportion of asyndeton with λέγω might be larger were it not for his fondness for φημί which he uses asyndeton 18 times in the same section, and syndeton only 7 times. He departs from Jn not so much in the direction of syndeton, as in the direction of still greater asyndeton, omitting even the verb of saying; e.g.,

I 29.4-6 Καὶ φησὶν 'εἴ τι ἀγαθὸν θέλεις, παρὰ σεαυτοῦ λάβε'. σὺ λέγεις 'οὔ· ἀλλὰ παρ' ἄλλου.' μὴ, ἀλλὰ παρὰ σεαυτοῦ. λοιπὸν ὅταν ἀπειλῇ ὁ τύραννος καὶ μὴ καλῇ, λέγω 'τίνι ἀπειλεῖ;' ἂν λέγῃ 'δήσω σε', φημὶ ὅτι 'ταῖς χερσὶν ἀπειλεῖ καὶ τοῖς ποσίν'. ἂν λέγῃ 'τραχηλοκοπήσω σε', λέγω 'τῷ τραχήλῳ ἀπειλεῖ'. ἂν λέγῃ 'εἰς φυλακήν σε βαλῶ', 'ὅλῳ σαρκιδίῳ'. κἂν ἐξορισμὸν ἀπειλῇ, τὸ αὐτό.—

A close parallel to Jn's use of λέγω including the historical present tense, is to be found in Hermas; e.g.,

Vis. I 3.3 μετὰ τὸ παῦσαι αὐτῆς τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα λέγει μοι· Θέλεις ἀκοῦσαί μου ἀναγινωσκούσης, λέγω κἀγώ·

---

10 AOFG, p.56.

Θέλω, κυρία. λέγει μοι· Γενοῦ ακροατὴς...

Vis. III 2.4 καὶ ἐπάρασα ῥάβδον τινὰ λαμπρὰν λέγει μοι· Βλέπεις μέγα πρᾶγμα; λέγω αὐτῇ· Κυρία, οὐδὲν βλέπω. λέγει μοι· Σύ, ἰδοὺ οὐχ ὁρᾶς...

Such passages, and the high percentage of asyndeton use of in Epictetus, weaken the claim advanced by Burney for translation from an Aramaic gospel.

1c. Asyndeton Imperatives

Montgomery notices this as a "Semitic-looking" case, and gives as an example 5:8 "Rise, take up."[11]

That this construction was not unknown in classical Greek is shown by Gildersleeve's casual examples given in another connection: Soph. Tr. 1255, Hom. Il. 3, 82.[12]

Its persistence into Hellenistic times is proven by numerous occurrences in the Discourses and the papyri; e.g.,

P Oxy I 33 (Report of a Trial ii AD) col. I, line 11 τρέχε, τέκνον, τελεύτα, and in the same ms., col. III, line 8.

Epict. I 25.30 τὸ ἱμάτιον λάβε, περίσχισον.

Epict. II 7.13 κύριε, ἐλέησον· ἐπίτρεψόν μοι ἐξελθεῖν

Epict. III 13.21 ἀσίτησον, ὑδροπότησον· ἀπόσχου ποτὲ παντάπασιν ὀρέξεως

In both Epictetus and the papyri, imperative sentences are construed asyndeton; e.g.,

P Oxy II 295 (Letter 35 AD) line 7 προσδέχου ἰς τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν Λουκία. γράψον μοι τὴν ἡμέραν. ἄσπασαι σὺ Α.

---

11 Origin, p. 16 12 Greek Syntax, i., pp. 163-165

Epict. I 25.8 προστάσσει σὺ πίε, σὺ κέρασον, σὺ ἆσον, σὺ ἄπελθε, σὺ ἐλθέ.

In P Lond II 265 (Instructions for converting Artabae 1 AD) in which almost every main verb is an imperative, asyndeton occurs 91 out of 116 times. Epictetus goes far beyond anything found in the Fourth Gospel both in the extent of individual series of asyndeton imperatives and in the frequency with which he employs the construction; e.g.,

III 21.5 τοιοῦτόν τι καὶ σὺ ποιήσον· φάγε ὡς ἄνθρωπος πίε ὡς ἄνθρωπος, κοσμήθητι, γάμησον, παιδοποίησον, πολίτευσαι· ἀνάσχου λοιδορίας, ἔνεγκε ἄδελφον ἀγνώμονα, ἔνεγκε πατέρα, ἔνεγκε υἱόν, γείτονα, σύνοδον.

Cf. I 16.11;17.16;18.14;24.5;25.8;27.6,9;29.10;II 1.35;20.26; III 5.3;12.15;13.21;14.3;21.6;24.85;26.22;IV 1.106;2.8;4.15; 9.11;11.17;13.15.

This would seem to indicate that the first readers of Jn's gospel found nothing unusual in his employment of an occasional asyndeton imperative.

2.Parataxis

As contrasted with the general "infrequency" of καί in Jn, Burney claims that it "is frequent in Jn. in speeches, linking coordinate clauses, as in a Semitic language."[13] This brief and rather vague statement is the extent of Burney's discussion of this construction; he does not say how frequent it is, nor does he tell us what the norm is in com-

---

13 AOFG, p.66.

parison with which Jn's use seems frequent.

A statistical study of this use would be superfluous in view of the work done by others on parataxis. MH refers[14] to Norden's claim that it is an evidence of some Semitic influence[15], and Deissman's reply that it is common in the papyri[16]. Radermacher after surveying late Greek usage concludes that a free and frequent use of καί was a feature of popular speech in Greek as in Hebrew[17].

To support the argument from parataxis in general, one example from the papyri may be cited. P Teb II 287 (Report of a Trial 161-169 AD) contains the speeches of two lawyers. The first, 8 lines in length, contains three long sentences in which καί links co-ordinate clauses three times; the second, 2 lines in length, contains one pair of co-ordinate clauses, and they are linked by καί. Any elaborate argument here seems unnecessary in view of the fact that this construction is common to practically all the Indo-European languages.

The infrequency of καί in narrative in Jn is mentioned rather incidentally in this connection by Burney.[18] He notes the occurrences as given by Abbott for the Synoptic Gospels: Mt 250 times, Mk more than 400 times, Lk about 380 times, Jn less than 100 times. His observation is "This com-

---

14 Grammar II iii. p.423.
15 Agnostos Theos, p.367.
16 LAE, 2d ed.,p.132n.; cf. Ibid,4th ed.,p.131f.
17 Grammatik,2d ed.,p.218.
18 AOFG,p.66.

parative infrequency seems to be due partly to the writer's use of asyndeton, partly for his fondness for οὖν."[19] It may be due in part to the fact noted elsewhere by Burney that Jn has much less narrative than the Synoptic Gospels have. Since both asyndeton and the frequency of οὖν are discussed elsewhere in this study, Burney's example is followed in omitting any discussion of the infrequency of καί as such.

2a. Rarity of Aorist Participle

The description of this idiom by Burney merits quotation: "In speaking above of Jn's phrase ἀπεκρίθη καὶ εἶπεν we noticed that the Synoptic equivalent subordinates the prior action[20] by use of the Aorist Participle, e.g. ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν, i.e. the natural Greek construction."[21] He gives statistics to show that such use of the aorist participle is less than one fourth as frequent in Jn as in the Synoptists. The conclusion which he draws is that the "over" use of parataxis in Jn, which lies behind the infrequent use of the aorist participle, is an evidence of the Aramaic original in which parataxis was naturally frequent.

The argument given above of course assumes that the norm of Koine Greek is the Synoptic Gospels, and that any divergence from them in quantity usage of an idiom is an over-use or under-use of the idiom in question and reveals Semitic influence. Koine usage was not, however, as standardized,

---

19 AOFG, p.66.
20 Italics mine.
21 AOFG, p.56f.

even, as the Synoptic Gospels. Other forces than Semitic influence caused a variation in usage much wider than that cited above. To suggest the extent of this variation, some figures have been compiled on the use of the aorist participle in Epictetus and the papyri. These figures are not worked out in exact detail, nor can their absolute accuracy be guaranteed, but the margin of error that may be included can hardly obliterate their significance.

A count of the aorist participles expressing action prior to the main verb in Epictetus I 1-11 indicates that they occur about once per WH page. If it were true that half of the instances had been overlooked, the result would still put Epictetus much nearer to the Fourth Gospel than to the others. In about 375 papyri, approximately 88 aorist participles that would come under the category established by Burney were counted. This would represent an average use more infrequent than that of Jn.

The extent of variability is shown by the fact that in the first 40 papyri studied, the aorist participle occurred but 13 times; yet in one papyrus P Oxy IX 1188 (Official correspondence about the purchase of wood 13 AD) it occurs 14 times in 29 lines.

These figures suggest that the over-use of parataxis as far as it is indicated by the rarity of the aorist participle has yet to be established for Jn. Moulton's claim that the paratactic was the less cultivated and literary style, still deserves consideration.

2b. The Rarity of the Genitive Absolute

The opinion of the Semitic scholars differs in regard to the use of the Genitive Absolute in Jn. Burney holds that its infrequency as compared with the Synoptists' is an evidence of the Semitic original.[22] Torrey, on the other hand, will not allow Wellhausen to eliminate the genitive absolute from the "Grundschrift": "It occurs frequently, however (Burney enumerates 17 cases), and is employed in precisely the manner of the LXX."[23] Burney, however, insists that it is used infrequently, the Aramaic equivalent (a ד temporal clause) having practically displaced it, this clause appearing in Jn with ὅτε slightly more frequently than in the Synoptic Gospels. A difference in manner of use is also noted by Burney: "the Synoptists use the construction, almost without exception, in temporal clauses," while Burney, following Abbott, sees a causal meaning in 2:3;5:13;6:18, and a concessive force in 12:37; 21:11 and perhaps in 20:19.[24]

On the question of frequency, it would seem that so far as the testimony of Epictetus and the papyri is valid, Jn's use is rather infrequent than frequent. On the basis of I 1-11, the Discourses seem to use the genitive absolute almost twice as frequently as Jn. And on the basis of 150 instances in 375 papyri, it would seem that the average frequency of genitive absolutes is about the same there as in the Discourses. But between individual papyri there is of

---

22 AOFG, p.57f. 23 Review, p.322. 24 AOFG, p.57.

course the same variability as that noted above in connection with the use of the aorist participle. Robinson gives 126 as the total number of genitive absolutes in the Apostolic Fathers, and points out the significant fact that they are very unequally divided: The Martyrdom of Polycarp, which is one twenty-fifth of the whole volume, having 31 out of the 126.[25]

Pernot would explain the relative infrequency in Jn as due to the fact that in that respect his language was closer to the spoken Greek, which today no longer knows the genitive absolute.[26]

The causal and concessive uses noted by Burney have nothing un-Greek in them. Goodwin says that in classical Greek it was used "at first to express time...and afterwards the other circumstantial relations, cause, condition, concession,etc. The construction is most fully developed in Attic prose, especially in the orators."[27]

3.Position of the Subject

The position of the subject in Jn has been attacked in three ways:- as usually following the verb, by Torrey; as coming at the end of the sentence, by Montgomery; and, particularly, in the case of σύ as both preceding and following the subject, by Burney.

Torrey's argument, as the more general, may well be

---

25 Syntax of the Participle in the Apostolic Fathers, Chicago 1913,p.39.
26 Revue des Etudes Grecques XXXVII 127
27 Syntax of Moods & Tenses of the Greek Verb,p.337

treated first. His argument is based on Wellhausen's observations on word-order in Jn:

so geht das Verbum in der Regel voran und das Subjekt kommt hinterdrein. Das scheint ähnlich zu sein wie bei Markus und im Semitischen. Aber die Ähnlichkeit wird dadurch zur Differenz, dass das Subjekt nicht alsbald auf das Verbum folgt, sondern mit Vorliebe an das äuserste Ende des Satzes rückt. So 2,9;6,3;18,33;19,38. Das Objekt, sei es ein Substantiv oder ein Pronomen, steht sehr oft vor dem Subjekt nicht selten auch vor dem regierenden Verb; namentlich vor dem Infinitive. Noch mehr unterscheidet sich Joa von Markus und dem Semitischen dadurch, dass der Genitiv oft vor dem Regens oder getrennt davon steht, sowohl der pronominale...als auch der substantivische...

Also ist die Wortstellun bei Joa im Allgemein unsemitisch und die Voransetzung des Verbs wird aus Nachahmung des biblischen Stils zu erklären sein.[28]

Torrey regards this explanation as having no plausibility, "in view of the general character of John's Greek."[29]

A fine review of the discussion of this subject is given in MH.[30] It quotes Lagrange as saying, "this order is Hebrew and Arabic rather than Aramaic and Assyrian(e.g. in Aramaic portions of Daniel the verb more often follows than precedes the subject)."[31] In the same work appears Kiecker's[32] tables of relative position of subject and verb in principal clauses in 20 pages of Herodotus, Thucydides, Polybius, The Chronicle of Theophanes, and Xenophon; and in 5 pages from each of the four evangelists. The conclusion reached in MH from a study of these figures is that "when all allowance has been made..., the predominance of initial position(of the

---

28 Das Evangelium Joannis, p.133.
29 Review, p.323.
30 II iii., pp.416-418.
31 Cf. Lagrange, S.Marc, p.lxxxviii.
32 Die Stellung des Verbs im Griechischen.

verb) in Luke and John[33] is remarkable." One of the significant facts for which allowance has been made by MH is that "in repeating dialogues the verb commonly goes before its subject."[34] Some definite figures on word-order are given by Ebeling, who finds, omitting relatives, "that in the Protagoras 65% and in the first book of the Anabasis 66% of the subjects precede their verbs."[35]

A count of the Discourses I 19-24 indicates that approximately 78% of Epictetus' subjects precede the verb. But the usage of the papyri seems to be quite different. A tabulation of the relative position of subject and verb in 96 papyri of the Roman period in which subjects occur gives the following totals: subject precedes verb 123 times; subject follows verb 171 times.

In the face of such variant testimony what can be said as to Jn's word order and its significance for an Aramaic original of the Gospel? First, that the observation of Lagrange on the Aramaic of Daniel leaves the Aramaic nature of the order verb-subject still to be established. Second, an alternative explanation may be found in the popular quality of Jn's Greek, since he is supported by the papyri but not by the literary works. Third, the un-Semitic nature of other parts of his word-order, as pointed out by Wellhausen, leads

---

33 The verb does NOT "usually precede" in Jn. Kiecker's figures put the verb first 71 times out of 144. A count in various chapters of all verbs except in relative clauses indicates that the verb never precedes in as many as 50% of the cases.

34 LS, s.v.

35 Gildersleeve Studies, p.238.

us to expect un-Semitic word order here. Fourth, influence of LXX style may be back of Jn's order; Lk's agreement with Jn would support this supposition on Burney's own explanation of the Greek of Lk. These are mere suggestions; for it seems fairly evident that in regard to both Aramaic and Greek word order so much is still uncertain that no argument of any weight can be based upon position of verb and subject.[36]

3a. Subject at End of Sentence

Montgomery notes in Jn "two cases where the subject is thrown apparently without warrant, to the end of the sentence: iii.24 οὔπω γὰρ ἦν βεβλημένος εἰς τὴν φυλακὴν Ἰωάνης. xiii.2 ἵνα παραδοῖ αὐτὸν Ἰούδας Σίμωνος Ἰσκαριώτης. for which I find parallels in Biblical Aramaic and Syriac."[37]

It is interesting to set against this Wellhausens observation that one of the things that characterized Jn's word order as un-Semitic was the fact "dass das Subjekt nicht alsbald auf das Verbum folgt, sondern mit Vorliebe an das äuserste Ende des Satzes rückt."[38]

At any rate, whatever the Aramaic order may be, there can be little doubt that Greek word order was free enough to make a subject at the end of the sentence nothing unusual. It would not be an arduous task to find examples in almost any Greek author; e.g.,

---

36 Cf. Delbrück's remark: "We have the general impression that the position is a matter of freedom."(Vergleichende Gram.d.indogermanischen Sprachen V iii.65) quoted in MH II iii.,p.437.

37 Origin, p.16 38 Cf.p.14 above.

Plutarch, Greek Questions 55, p.36 Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα πλεύσαντες αὖθις εἰς τὴν νῆσον, ἐκράτησαν τῶν πολεμίων οἱ Σάμιοι.

In the Discourses of Epictetus, the subject occurs at the end of the sentence very frequently:

I 25.24 καὶ σὺ γίγνωσκε, ὅτι ὃ ἂν φυλάσσειν ἐθέλῃς, κατ' ἐκεῖνο ἐπιβήσεταί σοι ὁ κύριος.

I 29.58 ἔστι γὰρ φιλοθέωρόν τι ζῷον ὁ ἄνθρωπος.

II 1.2 ἐναντίον γάρ πως δοκεῖ τῷ θαρραλέῳ τὸ εὐλαβές,...

I 12.15 πῶς δὲ γίνεται; ὡς διέταξεν ὁ διατάσσων.

cf. I 12.30;15.3;17.3;19.17,19,28;25.8,32;27.17;29.21,42; II 1.33;15.20; IV 1.46,154,166,168,177;2.4;5.2,9,20;8.22,24; etc.; and P Lond II 328(Live Stock Return 163 AD) line 18f.

In the light of such examples, the passages in Jn do not seem convincing evidence of Aramaic influence, even though in them there seems to be no warrant for putting the subject at the end of the sentence. The warrant is no stronger in many of the passages cited above from the Discourses.

3b. Σύ before and after Verb

The fact that σύ stands both before and after the verb in Jn is regarded by Burney as a striking evidence of agreement with Aramaic idiom, which could place the pronoun in either position. He cites 1:21b; 18:37; 19:9 as examples of

the use after the verb in questions; and 4:19 and 8:48 in statements. The pronoun preceding the verb is found in 1:42, 49; 3:10; 7:52;etc.; and these passages look to Burney "like" a close reproduction of an Aramaic original."[39]

To this Lagrange replies[40] that aside from the fact that the Aramaic has no verb to translate, the Greek has both positions for σύ. He concludes that σύ at the end of the sentence in Jn's dialogues is amply justified by the following examples: Menander, Heros 6, Discept. 324, Soph. OR 1122.

In the Discourses, σύ occurs both before and after th the verb even in parallel expressions;e.g.,

I 22.5 τί λέγεις σύ, ὦ Ἀγάμεμνον;

I 22.6 σὺ δὲ τί λέγεις, ὦ Ἀχιλλεῦ;

It occurs in both positions also with the copula:

IV 8.37 τοιοῦτον εἶ καὶ σὺ φυτάριον.

I 29.47 σὺ γὰρ ἄξιος εἶ προσαχθῆναι μάρτυς ὑπ' ἐμοῦ.

III 1.22 'σὺ οὖν τίς εἶ;'. . .'σὺ δὲ τίς εἶ;'

III 5.2 Ἐν οἴκῳ γὰρ ἄνασσις ἦς σύ;

Σύ occasionally follows its verb in the papyri;e.g., in P Teb II 409 (Letter 5 AD), and

BGU II 523 (Personal Letter) line 15f. ἔπισα Ἀπολλώνιον, δύνῃ καὶ σύ, ἐὰν ἀναβῇς, πισθῆναι...

Such occurrences counterbalance any freedom in Aramaic word order which allowed σύ to precede or follow its verb, and furnish close parallels to the passages cited in Jn.

---

39 AOFG, p.82 40 S.Jean, p.cxiv.

4a. Imperative and Future Indicative

Three verbal sequences in Jn have been attacked as evidences of Aramaic influence: the imperative followed by the future indicative, the participle followed by a finite verb, the aorist followed by an imperfect.

Burney points out that the verbal sequence imperative and future indicative is idiomatic in Hebrew, but that it is not so characteristic of Aramaic as it is of Hebrew "except where the sequence is clearly to be regarded as the result of the preceding imperative."[41] This, he claims, is the case in the Aramaic of Ezra 7:19-20 and the Greek of Jn 1:39 Ἔρχεσθε καὶ ὄψεσθε, and 16:24 αἰτεῖτε καὶ λήμψεσθε.

There can be no doubt as to the prevalence of imperative followed by future indicative expressing result in the Koine. It is common in the Papyri; e.g.,

P Oxy III 531 (Letter ii AD) line 10f. ἀλλὰ τοῖς βιβλίοις σου αὐτὸ μόνον πρόσεχ[ε] φιλολογῶν καὶ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὄνησιν ἕξεις.

P Oxy I 40 (A Legal Decision ii/iii AD) line 8 δίδαξον τ[ὸ κατ]ηκον, εἰ ἰατρὸς εἶ δημοσ[ιεύ]ων ἐπὶ ταρι[χειᾶ], καὶ ἕξεις ἀλειτουργησίαν.

Cf. P Fay 117 (Letter of Gemellus 108 AD) line 13; P Oxy VI 886 (Magical Formula iii AD) line 20f.; P Oxy X 1294 (Letter ii/iii AD) line 11f. In Epictetus it is more than common:

I 28.20 (& IV 1.51) Ζήτει καὶ εὑρήσεις.

---

41 AOFG, p.95

I 4.15 τοῦτό μοι δείκνυε καὶ ἐρῶ...

I 19.28 Γράψον αὐτὸ εἰς λίθον καὶ μενεῖ.

II 2.20 εἰ γὰρ σταυρωθῆναι θέλεις, ἔκδεξαι καὶ ἥξει ὁ σταυρός.

I 20.14 ἀνάγνωθι τὰ Ζήνωνος καὶ ὄψει

In the last example, note that the second verb is ὄψομαι as in Jn 1:39; so also in II 8.25; I 18:4;29.61; II 12.4,15;18.3; 19.34;24.29; IV 13.15. For examples with other verbs, cf. I 4.29;15.5; II 1.35;2.25;16.20;19.20;20.4;22.9,10;26.7; III 9. 22(twice);17.1;20.12(twice);26.39; IV 7.13,18. The two instances in Jn shrink into insignificance when compared with such usage.

4b.Participle and Finite Verb

Burney calls attention to Jn 1:32 τὸ πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον...καὶ ἔμεινεν ἐπ' αὐτόν, and 5:44 λαμβάνοντες, καὶ ...οὐ ζητεῖτε as being exactly analogous to a Hebrew idiom, of which some examples exist in Aramaic.[41]

The place of the idiom in Greek usage is plainly stated in WM:

> The illustrations of anacolouthon which have been given thus far are of such a nature that they might well occur in any language. We have now to mention some particular kinds of anacolouthon which have especially established themselves in Greek usage:-...b.After a participle we often find a transition to the construction with a finite verb: in this case the verb may be accompanied by δέ .[42]

It refers to Demosth. II 75,V 437,573, Plutarch IV 323. In KG[43] much the same statement is made and numerous examples

---

41 AOFG,p.96f. 42 p.715f. 43 # 490,4.

are given from Homer, Thucydides, Xenophon, and others. MH[44] calls attention to the citation of nine passages from the Cyrop. by Holden, in which this construction occurs; and quotes Shilleto on Thuc. I 57,58 to the effect that the idiom was very common in Greek.[45]

As an example of the idiom in Hellenistic Greek, MH quotes[46] P Ryl.ii.153,40 (138-161 AD) "If anything happen to my son being childless and intestate," ἢ καὶ τέκνα μὲν εἴχοντι ἐπιμεταλ(λ)άξῃ δὲ καὶ τὰ τέκνα, "or if he has children in the case of the decease of those children."

Another example from the Papyri is the following,

BGU III 846 (Letter ii AD) line 13f. Ἤκουσα παρὰ το[ῦ Ποσ]τούμου τὸν εὑρόντα σαι ἐν τῷ Ἀρσινοείτῃ καὶ ἀκαιρίως πάντα σοι διήγηται.

In Epict. I 21.7 participle and finite verb are plainly coordinated as the context shows:

ἢ γὰρ ἔστι τινὰ [καὶ] οὕτως φαίνεται ἢ οὐκ ὄντα οὐδὲ φαίνεται ὅτι ἔστιν ἢ ἔστιν καὶ οὐ φαίνεται ἢ οὐκ ἔστι καὶ φαίνεται.

Examples of this sequence in later Greek are given by Jannaris.[47] It would seem, therefore, that the participle coordinated with the finite verb was well-established in Greek usage throughout the history of the language; and its value as evidence of Aramaic influence is proportionately weak.

---

44 II iii., p.428
45 cf. also Lagrange S.Jean, p.cvii.
46 II iii., p.429
47 An Historical Greek Grammar, # 2168b.

4c.Aorist and Imperfect

The Hebrew construction with waw consecutive has its counterpart in Biblical Aramaic and early Syriac in a sequence of tenses begun with the perfect tense and continued with participles. And this, Montgomery claims, explains why, in Jn, "the imperfect is constantly cropping up in contrast to the aorists in the neighborhood."[48] His examples, "taken at random":

10:24 ἐκύκλωσαν οὖν αὐτὸν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ ἔλεγον αὐτῷ...

19:2 καὶ οἱ στρατιῶται...ἐπέθηκαν αὐτοῦ τῇ κεφαλῇ, καὶ ἱμάτιον πορφυροῦν περιέβαλον αὐτόν, καὶ ἤρχοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ ἔλεγον...

4:47 ἀπῆλθεν πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ ἠρώτα ἵνα καταβῇ καὶ ἰάσεται αὐτοῦ τὸν υἱόν,

8:21 Εἶπον οὖν πάλιν αὐτοῖς...22 ἔλεγον οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι...23 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς...24 εἶπον οὖν ὑμῖν... 25 ἔλεγον οὖν αὐτῷ... εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς...

It should be noted in regard to these passages that of the seven imperfects, one is of ἔρχομαι the other six of verbs of saying, five being ἔλεγε(-ον).

The comments of KG on such usage in classical Greek is appropriate enough to warrant quotation:

> Häufig wird das Imperfekt gebraucht, wo man eine abgeschlossene, nicht eine noch in der Entwickelung begriffene Handlung ausgedrückt erwarten solte, wo also das Imperfekt statt des Aorists zu stehen scheint. Dieser Gebrauch findet sich besonders häufig...in der Prosa bei den Verben des

---

48 Origin, p.18

Schickens und Gehens...sowie des Sagens, Ermänterns u. ähnl. z.B. λέγειν, ἀγγέλειν, ἄρχεσθαι λόγου...
E,364f. ...ἔβαινε ... λάζετο (vorher aber δῶκε u. nachher μάστιξεν u.s.w.) k,231 θύρας ὤϊξε ... καὶ κάλει...
B,43ff.(Impf.,Aor.,Impf.) H,303ff.(Aor.,Impf.).[49]

Gildersleeve admits a succession of aorist and imperfect but denies any "actual interchange of tenses."[50] Goodwin says that it was at times a matter of indifference which form was used; "For example," he goes on, "this distinction can seldom be important in such expressions as he said, he commanded; and we find ἔλεγεν and ἐκέλευον in the historians where no idea of duration can have been in mind."[51]

The results of Hultsch's study[52] furnish further evidence that the passages cited from Jn contain nothing un-Greek. He found in Polybius that when the verbs were joined by Καί the transition from aorist to imperfect was more common than the reverse.[53] He cites passages where not only λέγω but also other verbs of saying occur in this sequence.[53] His examples of verbs whose imperfect with Καί is joined to a preceding aorist fill four pages(25-28), while aside from other connectives, those joined by μέν...δέ fill five pages(30-34).

It is not,therefore, surprising to find in Epictetus and the papyri, an aorist followed by an imperfect; e.g.,

P Oxy VI 930 (Letter ii/iii AD) line 11f. ἐμέλησε δὲ μοι πέμψαι καὶ πυθέσθαι περὶ τῆς ὑγίας

---

49 # 383,3

50 Greek Syntax,p.90f.

51 Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb,17.

52 Die Erzählenden Zeitformen bei Polybius iii.

53 op.cit.,p.23.

σου καὶ ἐπιγνῶναι τί ἀναγεινώσκεις· καὶ ἔλεγεν τὸ ζῆτα, ἐμαρτύρει δὲ πολλὰ περὶ τοῦ παιδαγωγοῦ σου.

Epict.II 16,16 'πῶς γὰρ ἡμεῖς καλῶς ἐβουλευσάμεθα;' οὐκ ἔλεγον σοι, ἄδελφέ, ὅτι ἀδύνατόν...

Epict.IV 1,73 Τίς δέ σοι εἶπεν 'τὸ περιπατῆσαι σὸν ἔργον ἐστὶν ἀκώλυτον'; ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐκεῖνο ἔλεγον ἀκώλυτον μόνον τὸ ὁρμῆσαι.

Since such parallels can be drawn from Greek literature and contemporary non-literary Greek usage, and since (as seems probable from Montgomery's own examples) the sequence is sometimes reversed in Jn as it is in Greek, the conclusion that Jn is following Aramaic idiom here because he differs from his "Synoptic compeers" may at least be regarded as open to question.

5.Cognate Dative

Montgomery mentions with other "Semitic constructions" Jn 3:29 χαρᾷ χαίρει in which he finds the infinitive absolute represented.[54]

There can be no doubt that this construction was used in the LXX to translate the infinitive absolute; Thackeray estimates its occurrence there at about 200 times. But it is interesting to note that he still concludes that it existed as a good Greek construction in the Koine. Moulton's argument[55] against Blass has been carried further by Radermacher[56]

---

54 Origin, p.16.
55 Prolegomena, p.75
56 Grammatik, p.129

who emphasizes the importance of the many parallels in Attic Tragedy and Old Comedy, and concludes that "Nur die grosse Verbreitung der Ausdrucksweise im Neuen Testament ist semitisierend."[57] Most of these parallels[58] are cited by MH[59] φόβῳ ταρβεῖν, φόβῳ δεδιέναι, φύσει πεφυκέναι, νόσῳ νοσεῖν, and the conclusion reached by Radermacher is quoted with approval.

Several idioms that appear in the papyri resemble this, but are not exactly identical; e.g.,

P Fay 84 (Receipt 163 AD) line 5 μεμετρήμεθα μέτρῳ δη(μοσίῳ)...

This cognate expression appears with almost formula-like regularity in a large number of papyri. cf. P Fay 122 (Letter 100 AD) line 11; P Teb 366 (Receipt 188 AD). Another similar and more frequent formula is

P Lond II 262 (Sale of House 11 AD) line 6 βεβαιωσω πασιν βεβαιωσει επι τον απαντα χρονον.

Cf. P Fay 92 (Sale of Donkey 126 AD) line 19; P Oxy I 100 (Sale of Land 133 AD) line 14; BGU I 71 (Sale of a vacant Lot 189 AD) line 19; etc. This construction as MH points out[59] is closer to Eph.1:3 than to Jn 3:29.

A very close parallel occurs at the end of the salutation in a later Christian papyrus:

P Oxy VIII 1162 (Letter of a Christian Priest iv AD)

---

57 loc.cit.
58 For other examples cf. KG # 410,2 Anmerk.4.
59 II iii.,p.453.

line 5 χαρᾷ χα[ί]ρειν.

The assumption that the solitary instance in Jn in which a cognate dative is found is due to translation from a Semitic original runs contrary to Dalman's statement that this construction was, apart from the Targums, quite unknown "in the Palestinian Aramaic of the Jews."[60] If a Semitic influence be necessary to explain the Johannine passage, it may be found operating through the medium of the LXX.[61] And it may be that the similar passages in I Thess. 3:9 and II Cor. 7:13 are not without significance in this connection.

6."Go and do" for "Continue to do"

Montgomery cites Jn 15:16 ἵνα ὑμεῖς ὑπάγητε καὶ καρπὸν φέρητε as representing the Hebrew and Aramaic halak, "which is used commonly in the sense 'to go on doing'."[62]

No passage in the papyri or Epictetus was found which could be translated as Montgomery translates Jn 15:16,"that you should go on bearing fruit." Nor does it seem necessary to translate Jn 15:16 in that fashion. The sentence, if so translated would read "It was not you who chose me, but I have chosen you and appointed you that you should go on bearing fruit, and your fruit will abide,etc." In other words, the disciples were bearing fruit before Jesus chose them; he merely commissioned them to continue the good work! It is

---

60 Words of Jesus,p.34
61 cf.W.Bauer, Wörterbuch,s.v. χαίρω,who cft.Isa.66:1o.
62 Origin, pp.16-17.

much more logical to regard this as the command which Jesus gave his disciples when he chose them.

What we have, then, in this clause is Jesus' orders phrased indirectly. This use of ὑπάγω as a rather superfluous introduction to an order is quite frequent in Epict.; e.g.,

III 22.5 ὕπαγε, περιέρχου καὶ οὕτως διακίνει ἀπὸ τῶν μεγίστων ἐπὶ τὰ μικρότατα.

Cf. also III 21.6;23.12;etc. Ἀπέρχομαι is used frequently by Epictetus in the same way; so in

I 4.15 ἄπελθε καὶ μὴ μόνον ἐξήγου τὰ βιβλία, ἀλλὰ καὶ γράφε αὐτὸς τοιαῦτα.

Cf. I 2.16;24.5; IV 11.34;etc.

In this Johannine passage, the conjecture of an Aramaic original, to say the most, does not improve on the present rendering; and needlessly changes a Greek construction well attested in contemporary usage.

7. Pronoun, Copula, Predicate

In commenting on Jn 15:1 ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἄμπελος Montgomery remarks, "the use of both pronoun and predicate verb is hardly Greek, which would generally find one or the other term sufficient."[63] He explains the construction as the laborious spelling out of the Aramaic <u>ena hu gefitta</u> by three words, the <u>hu</u> "it" being rendered by the predicate verb.

It is true that in Greek it is possible to omit the

---

63 <u>Origin</u>, p.18.

the predicate verb in such a sentence. But the occurrence of subject-pronoun, copula, and predicate noun is common enough in Hellenistic Greek to make the hypothesis of a singularly slavish mistranslation of an Aramaic idiom unnecessary. This idiom is especially at home in the Greek of the period in solemn pronouncements: the self-revelation of deity, the proclamation of majesty, or any emphatic statement of identity.

Deissmann gives examples of the idiom in the declarations of the goddess Isis taken from an inscription of the ii/iii AD, e.g., [64]

Εἶσις ἐγώ εἰμι... ἐγώ εἰμι Κρόνου θυγάτηρ πρεσβυτάτη

With which may be compared Plutarch's quotation[65] of an inscription in honor of Isis:

ἐγώ εἰμι πᾶν τὸ γεγονὸς καὶ ὂν καὶ ἐσόμενον

Deissmann also first called attention to this usage in the magical papyri.[66]

Walter Bauer[67] regards the idiom as oriental in origin, but in Imperial times much at home in magical usage and in the royal statements of deity. He cites as further examples

Orig. c.Cels. VII 9 ἐγὼ ὁ θεὸς εἰμι...

Hermetica I 6 τὸ φῶς ἐκεῖνο ἐγώ εἰμι Νοῦς,

and in addition to passages in various N.T. Apocrypha, a

---

64 cf. LAE, p.134ff. for the complete inscription.
65 Plutarchi Moralia, ed. Bern., pp.478-479.
66 Bible Studies i., p.355; cf. MM, Vocab. s.v.
67 Das Johannes Evangelium, Exkurs zu 8:12.

large number of examples of "I-style" from the Mandaean literature.

The impression gathered from a study of all these instances is likely to be that this idiom occurs only in religious liturgy, the literature of obscure oriental sects, and the magician's strange lore. Over against this should be set its use in Epictetus, where it occurs in every sort of emphatic declaration of identity. The teacher uses it to declare to a man his true nature:

II 8.11 σὺ ἀπόσπασμά εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ.

III 17.33 σὺ θεὸς εἶ, ὦ ἄνθρωπε,

He uses it to state his own relationship to his disciples:

II 19.29 Καὶ νῦν ἐγὼ μὲν παιδευτής εἰμι ὑμέτερος,

It is used in an imaginary dialogue:

III 1.23 μὴ δὴ λέγε τῷ ἐξαιρέτῳ 'σὺ οὖν τί εἶ;' εἰ δὲ μή, ἐρεῖ σοι φωνὴν λαβόν ποθεν 'ἐγώ εἰμι τοιοῦτον οἷον ἐν ἱματίῳ πορφύρα.

The tyrant uses it for his boast:

I 19.2: ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ πάντων κράτιστος.

The citizen to declare his trade:

IV 18.16 ἐγὼ μουσικός εἰμι... ἐγὼ χαλκεύς εἰμι,

The student to deny his bondage:

IV 1.8 πῶς γὰρ, φησίν, ἐγω δοῦλός εἰμι.

With these last two passages cf.

BGU II 511 (Record of a Trial before Claudius) col.III line 8 [Ἐγ]ὼ μὲν οὐκ εἰμι δοῦλος οὐδὲ μουσικῆς [κεν]ός.

Cf. also Epict.I 10.6,7;27.17;III 22.5,6,88;IV 7.31;8.15,25,

26;13.11. The evidence of Epictetus alone is sufficient to show that Jn's use of this construction is very possible Greek indeed.

8. Ὄνομα αὐτῷ for "his name"

This construction, which occurs twice in Jn: 1:6 and 3:1, is regarded by both Montgomery and Burney as due to Semitic influence. Most of the Semitic parallels cited do not seem very convincing. Why should the <u>dative</u> have a parallel in Ezra 5:14, "Sheshbazzar <u>his</u> name," as Montgomery suggests[68]? Would not ὄνομα αὐτοῦ be a closer parallel to the Semitic construction? And what consideration is due the long list of parallels from Syriac given by Burney[69] in almost all of which the relative pronoun is expressed? The only significant item in the evidence adduced is the LXX use of ὄνομα αὐτῷ to render the Hebrew לוֹ שֵׁם. The significance to be attached to this is not necessarily that they are using the one Greek construction that corresponds literally to the Hebrew. Ὄνομα αὐτῷ is only one of several ways of saying "his name" in Greek, but it does have that use in both classical and Hellenistic Greek.

The significance of the fact "that the only other occurrences of ὄνομα αὐτῷ are found in the Apocalypse, which is strongly Semitic in colouring"[70] is somewhat dimmed by its occurrence in the following passages in classical Greek:

X.An. 1.5,4 ἐνταῦθα ἦν πόλις μεγάλη, ὄνομα δ'

---

68 <u>Origin</u>, p.16. 69 <u>ACFG</u>, p.30f. 70 <u>ACFG</u>, p.32.

αὐτῇ Κορσωτή[71]

Odys. IX 366 Οὖτις ἐμοί γε ὄνομα.

Herod. 1.179 ἔστι δὲ ἄλλη πόλις...Ἴς οὔνομα αὐτῇ.[72]

Walter Bauer[73] refers to Demosth.32,11; Dionys.Hal.8,89,4, and quotes

Aelian nat.an. 8,2 γυνὴ...Ἡρακλὶς ὄνομα αὐτῇ.

To these may be added the following examples from Plutarch:

De Iside et Osiride, ed.Bern.pp.484-5 ὅπου τῇ πόλει μέχρι νῦν ὄνομα Κοπτώ.

Ibid, p.486 ὄνομα δὲ τῷ μὲν βασιλεῖ Μάλκανδρον εἶναι φασιν· αὐτῇ δ' οἱ μὲν Ἀστάρτην οἱ δὲ Σαωσιν...

Nor is this construction entirely unknown to the Discourses and the papyri. It occurs three times at least in the following papyrus,

P Oxy III 465 (Astrological Calendar ii AD) col.I, line 12 ὁ δὲ Κρατδιὸς αὐτοῦ, ὄνομα αὐτῷ ἐστιν Νεβύ

Ibid, col.V,line 159 ὁ δὲ υἱὸς τῆς θεᾶ[ς] ὄνομα αὐτῷ ἐστιν...

Ibid, col.VII,line 199 ὄνομα αὐτῷ ἐστιν Τετ...

It is found twice in the Discourses in the form of an indirect question:

II 10.12 ἐὰν δ' ἀπελθὼν ψέγη[σ]σου τὸν ἀδελφόν λέγω σοι 'ἐπελάθου τίς εἶ καὶ τί σοι ὄνομα.'

---

71 Quoted with similar exx. by KG # 356,2.
72 Quoted with other exx. by Pallis, Notes on St.John and the Apocalypse,p.l.
73 Wörterbuch, s.v. ὄνομα

IV 12.16 ἐπὶ τούτοις δὲ μεμνῆσθαι, τίνες ἐσμὲν καὶ τί ἡμῖν ὄνομά,

These examples show that what is needed to complete the expression ὄνομα αὐτῷ is not a relative pronoun, as Burney argued, but ἐστι . And that this is so in Jn is shown by

Jn 18:10 ἦν δὲ ὄνομα τῷ δούλῳ Μάλχος.

The supposition that this was a Semitic construction in Jn was made possible in the first place only by regarding N.T. Greek as an isolated language. That the construction in Jn is Greek is amply demonstrated by the passages quoted above.

9.Plural verb with singular Subject

Montgomery mentions this as a Semitic construction and claims Jn 7:49 ἀλλὰ ὁ ὄχλος οὗτος ὁ μὴ γινώσκων τὸν νόμον ἐπάρατοί εἰσιν as an example of it.[74] More exactly, however, what we have here is a collective subject with a plural verb from which it is separated by a participial clause.

In classical Greek such a construction would pass without comment. Gildersleeve remarks that "nouns of multitude often take the verb in the plural,"[75] and among others gives the following examples:

Xen.Hell. III 3.4 τοιαῦτα ἀκούσασα ἡ πόλις Ἀγησίλαον εἵλοντο βασιλέα.

---

74 Origin,p.16. 75 Greek Syntax i.,p.54.

Plato,Legg.948C μέρος...τι... ἀνθρώπων...οὐχ ἡγοῦνται θεούς.

Aeschyl.Ag.189 εὖτ(ε)...βαρυνοντ' Ἀχαιϊκὸς λεώς.

Pind.P.2.46-47 ἐκ δ'ἐγένοντο στρατὸς θαυμαστός.

Hom.Il.2.278 ὡς φάσαν ἡ πληθύς.

That the construction persisted through Hellenistic times is shown by a similar use in P Fay 117 (Letter of Gemellus 108 AD) line 24f., and the examples of its occurrence given by Jannaris.[76]

10.Casus Pendens

This "Semitic" construction is characteristic of Hebrew and Aramaic, and Burney quotes 27 examples from Jn: 1.12;...3:26;...5:11;etc.[77] The examples he gives fall into the following three classes: a relative pronoun, or a participle used as a substantive, or a noun, continued by a personal or demonstrative pronoun;e.g.,

3:32 ὃ ἑώρακεν καὶ ἤκουσεν τοῦτο μαρτυρεῖ.

1:33 ὁ πέμψας με βαπτίζειν ἐν ὕδατι ἐκεῖνός μοι εἶπεν

1:18 μονογενὴς θεὸς ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο.

It is to be noted that this construction with the relative pronoun is not the same as the relative completed by a pronoun. In that case the pronoun occurs in the relative clause; in this case in the following clause. Noteworthy also is the fact that in the third class, the noun-always a nominative-is

---

76 An Historical Greek Grammar,p.314.
77 AOFG,pp.63-65.

often followed by a relative or participial clause. This construction occurs 12 times with the relative, 10 times with the participle, 5 times with a noun.

The nominative of the participle or noun in this "absolute" construction was fairly frequent in classical Greek. Bauer speaks of ἐκεῖνος after a participial subject as "abounding".[78] WM mentions it with some particular kinds of anacolouthon which have especially established themselves in Greek usage, and cite Xen.Cyr.2.3.5, Ec.1.14, Ael.7.1.[79] Gildersleeve quotes from Plato, Isoc.,Andoc., Xen., Hdt., Eur., Aeschyl., and Hom.[80]

Many of the references already given treat also of the casus pendens with the relative pronoun. Goodwin might have been describing Johannine usage in the following:

"When a clause containing a relative with omitted antecedent precedes the leading clause, the latter often contains a demonstrative referring back with emphasis to the omitted antecedent; as ὃ ἐβούλετο ταῦτα ἔλαβεν, what he wanted, that he took, etc."[81]

WM speaks of this construction as occurring "almost regularly" and cites passages from Xenophon, Plato, and others.[82]

There can be no doubt as to the regularity of the

---

78 Wörterbuch, s.v. ἐκεῖνος.
79 p.715.
80 Greek Syntax i.p.3. cf. also Moulton, Prolegomena, p.69; Thumb, Hellenismus, p.131; Lagrange, S.Jean, p.cxf.; MH II iii., pp.424-425; Radermacher, Grammatik, p.21f.
81 Grammar, p.210, note 3.
82 p.186.

three types of this construction in Hellenistic Greek. A fine parallel to the use with the relative occurs in the papyri:

BGU I 19 (Law suit Record 135 AD) col.II, Line 4f. Ὅσα προσήναντο πα[τρι?]κῶν περὶ τὸν προκείμενον ἀπὸ τῆς εὐ[δ]αιμονίδος διαθήκης...ταῦτα μετεῖναι τοῖς ἐκείνου τέκνοις. cf. Jn 1:12, also BGU II 372 (Official Decree 154 AD) col.II, line 19f., where ἐάν τις occurs in the same construction. The casus pendens with the noun occurs in true "Semitic" fashion in

BGU II 523 (Personal Letter) line 21f. Τὰς οὖν δραχμὰς ἑξήκοντα δὸς αὐτὰ Ἥλιτι τῷ ἐμῷ.

and in P Oxy II 299 (Letter 1 AD) line 2; P Oxy II 268 (Notice of Death) 61 AD) line 2. The same construction with the participle also occurs in the papyri; e.g.,

P Fay 127 (Letter of Gemellus 108 AD) line 5 Καλῶς ποιήσις τὼ ἐπιβάλλον ὑμῖν τοῦ καρποῦ τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος δ[ο]ῦναι αὐτὸ τῇ ἀδελφῇ σου.

Cf. BGU II 385 (Letter ii/iii AD) line 7; P Oxy II 258 (Selection of Boys 86-87 AD) line 15.

In Epictetus the construction occurs so frequently as to make an adequate presentation of his use difficult. The participle as a nominative absolute occurs in

III 3.8 Καὶ λοιπὸν ὁ τῶν ἐκτός τινων ἐκχωρῶν οὗτος τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ τυγχάνει.

Cf. I 8.3;14.10;29.52; II 6.22;24.3; IV 1.164. That the use with the participle was equivalent to the use with the relative is shown by

II 22.3

II 22.3 ὅστις οὖν ἀγαθῶν ἐπιστήμων ἐστίν, οὗτος ἂν καὶ φιλεῖν εἰδείη· ὁ δὲ μὴ δυνάμενος διακρῖναι τὰ ἀγαθὰ ἀπὸ τῶν κακῶν καὶ τὰ οὐδέτερα ἀπ' ἀμφοτέρων πῶς ἂν ἔτι οὗτος φιλεῖν δύναιτο.

where the two are coordinated.

Of these two equivalent constructions, Epictetus' favorite was the relative completed by a demonstrative, which he uses approximately 75 times with all the forms of the relative;e.g.,

II 5.12 ὃ δύναται, τοῦτο μόνον ποιῶ.

II 21.4 ὅσα ἂν αἰσχρὰ φαντάζωντα, ταῦτα οὐ πάνυ ὁμολογοῦσι.

I 25.2 περὶ ἃ ἐσπουδάκαμεν, τούτων ἐξουσίαν οὐδεὶς ἔχει· ὧν ἐξουσίαν οἱ ἄλλοι ἔχουσιν, τούτων οὐκ ἐπιστρέφομεθα.

Cf.I 9.21;24.13;25.24;27.2;29.64; II 1.24;2.21;5.21;7.11;10.23;12.11;13.14;16.37;21.17,18;22.1;23.39; III 1.4,44; IV 1.77, 99;6.5;10.14;3.3.[83]

But Epictetus does not completely slight the form of the construction in which a noun is completed by a personal or demonstrative pronoun, although, like Jn, he uses it infrequently;e.g.,

III 1.22 οὐδὲ γὰρ λέοντι τὸ τύχον βοίδιον τολμᾷ ἀντιστῆναι αὐτῷ.

IV 5.28 ἀλλὰ τὸ περὶ ἑκάστου τούτων δόγμα, τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ βλάπτον. . .

---

83 For further exx. cf. Schenkl's Index.

cf. I 6.32;6.9;7.33; IV 6.16.

Moreover, Epictetus uses οὗτος after εἴ τις, ἐάν, ὅταν, ἐπείδη, ὅτι, ὅπως and numerous other conjunctions[84] in a lavish fashion that far surpasses Jn. He shares with Jn a very similar idiom that is often regarded as Semitic: ὅπου... ἐκεῖ, cf. IV 4.15;11.25,26;7.14,36 and often.

The wide range of the casus pendens in classical and Hellenistic Greek and especially in Epictetus renders the assumption of an Aramaic original as the explanation of occurrences in Jn unnecessary.

Lagrange admits that this construction is "parfaitment grecque"[85] and that there is here no indication of a translation, "ni meme emploi d'une tournure semitique;" and his conclusion that Jn's use is to be explained as "emploi frequent d'une tournure qui convient mieux aux Semites a cause de leur maniere plus energique que variee" does not seem compelling. The assumption that energy and lack of variety characterize the writings of one race with such uniformity and exclusiveness that they can be used to identify that race's literary productions is not borne out by the facts. A frequent use of the casus pendens is supposed to illustrate this "Semitic" manner; but Epictetus here, as elsewhere, is more "Semitic" than JN. The casus pendens in Jn is good Greek, not is the frequency of its use at all suspicious when the much greater frequency of its occurrence

---

84 cf. Schenkl's Index, s.v. οὗτος
85 S.Jean, p.cx.

in the Discourses of Epictetus is considered.

11. A Term indicating Place after a Geographical Name

This "distinctively Aramaic"[86] idiom which indicates that the place named is a city, country, village, place, etc. is recognized by Montgomery[87] in four Johannine passages:

11:54 εἰς Ἐφραὶμ λεγομένην πόλιν

7:42 ΚΑΙ ΑΠΟ ΒΗΘΛΕΕΜ τῆς κώμης ὅπου ἦν Δαυείδ

19:17 ὁ λεγόμενος κρανίου τόπος

11:1 Λάζαρος ἀπὸ Βηθανίας ἐκ τῆς κώμης Μαρίας καὶ Μάρθας τῆς ἀδελφῆς αὐτῆς.

For the last passage, he thinks the original was "Lazarus from Bethany-the-village, the brother of Mary and Martha."

These four passages furnish us with examples of two Greek idioms: 11:54 and 19:17 the use of λεγόμενος with the term indicating place before or after a geographical name; 7:42 and 11:1 a geographical name followed by a term indicating place. It is, perhaps, significant that in the latter case, where λεγόμενος does not occur, there is an additional phrase defining the κώμης.

A form of the idiom in which καλούμενος occurs is found in classical Greek; e.g., Herod.113, Strabo 17:35.[87]

The Johannine construction with λεγόμενος is very common in the papyri. The frequency of the idiom and the variety of places so indicated is shown in the following ex-

---

86 So Montgomery, Origin, p.14f.
87 Quoted by Gildersleeve, Greek Syntax ii., p.242.

amples, where in each example a different type of place, such as village, alley, square, etc., is mentioned:

P Oxy I 99 (Sale of House Property 55 AD) line 7 εἰς τὴν τῶν ποιμένων λεγομένη⟨ν⟩ λαυρα⟨ν⟩.

P Oxy II 249 (Registration of Property 80AD) line 15 ἐν τῷ Παμμένους λεγομένῳ παραδείσου[=παραδείσῳ].

P Teb II 311 (Lease of Temple Land 134 AD) line 17f. ἐν τῷ λεγομένῳ Νεωφύτῳ γύῳ.

P Oxy VI 918 (Land Survey 11 AD) col.II,line 13 λιβὸς Τεκνάνις λεγομ(ένη) διῶρυξ...

BGU I 217 (Receipt 11/111 AD) line 4 ἐν τόπῳ Παλσινα λε[γ]ομένο[υ]...

For further examples cf. P Lond II 358 (Petition ca.150 AD) line 4; P Lond II 289 (Ratification of Sale 91 AD) line 14; P Teb II 382 (Division of Land 30 BC-1 AD) col.II,line 6; BGU I 139 (Declaration of property 201 AD) line 9; P Oxy II 254 (Census return ca. 20 AD) line 3; and others.[88]

The second form of the construction, that which lacks λεγόμενος is as common to Greek usage as the one just discussed. Gildersleeve [89] quotes

HDT 2:59 ἐς βούβαστιν πόλιν...ἐς βούσιριν πόλιν...Σάϊν πόλιν and 2:67,29-31,156,61, and others. KG[90] quote Th.8:108; 3:100,103; 1:116,109; 4:13,67,54; 2:94; HDT 1:43, in which passages islands, cities, mountains, etc., are designated in the

---

88 cf. MM, Vocab., s.v. λέγω.
89 Greek Syntax ii.,p.245.
90 # 462,a.

same way. The same constructions are found in Plutarch's Greek Questions; e.g.,

293A p.19 Κερκυράν τὴν νῆσον

298A p.27 Σάνην μὲν πόλιν

The frequent recurrence of πόλις, κώμης, μέρος, κλήρος, κτλ, in the papyri will, with Plutarch's help, make up for the lack of this construction in Epictetus. The formulas in which the names of the leading cities are found occur again and again;

P Oxy I 38 (Petition to the Prefect 49-50 AD) line 2 τῶν ἀπ' Ὀξυρύγχων πόλεως

P Lond II 304 (Live Stock Return 144 AD) ἀπὸ κωμης Σοκνοπαίου Νήσου

The names of less important cities and villages occur in the same construction:

P Oxy III 485 (Notification to the Strategus 178 AD) line 15 ἀπὸ Ψωβθεως τῆς μητροπόλεως τῆς μικρᾶς Ὀάσεως.

P Fay 120 (Letter of Gemellus 120 AD) line 6 εἰς Ἀφροδίτην πόλιν

P Oxy III 488 (Petition to the Epistrategus 11/111 AD) line 11 ἐν κλήρῳ λεγομ(ένῳ) Διαγραφῆς ἐν πεδίοις Κρήκεως κώμης.

Cf. P Oxy I 39 (Release from Military Service 52 AD) line 8; P Oxy IX 1185 (Letter of a Prefect ca.200 AD) line 27; BGU I 112 (Declaration of Property 58-60 AD) line 2; P Oxy II 270 (Indemnification of a Surety 94 AD) line 22; P Lond II 256d (Order for Delivery of Seed-corn 11 AD) line 4; and many others.

12.Puns in Jn

Montgomery calls attention to the play on τὸ πνεῦμα which is used to mean "wind" and "spirit" in 3:8.[91]

He does this to suggest, one supposes, that this word-play is possible in the Semitic languages. It is also possible in the Greek writings of a Christian. It is true that "elsewhere in the N.T. πνεῦμα never has its primitive meaning 'wind'."[92] but by "primitive meaning" Bernard here means "Greek meaning" and πνεῦμα very clearly has this meaning of "wind" in classical and Hellenistic Greek.

The classic study of πνεῦμα by President Burton[93] states that it occurs with the meaning "wind" in Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Aristophanes, Herodotus, Thucydides, Demosthenes, Plato, and Aristotle, and gives examples of this usage. The only possible difficulty then would be whether the author of the Fourth Gospel would, as a Greek, know the meaning "spirit" for πνεῦμα. The results of the study mentioned above indicate that in Greek usage πνεῦμα had come to have a distinctly vital sense as in the writings of Aristotle and Epictetus, but no such meaning as in O.T. and Christian usage. The author of the Fourth Gospel was, however, a Christian; and in such circumstances it is hard to see what argument as to Semitic origins can be based on this

---

91 Origin, p.16.
92 Bernard, St.John, pp.106-107.
93 Spirit, Soul, and Flesh, p.13.

word-play.

Walter Bauer, in commenting on Jn 2:22, notes a large number of instances of a play on the Greek words:

Die Doppelsinnigkeit, die dadurch 22 das ἐγείρειν gewinnt, stellt es zu anderen ähnlich schillernden Ausdrücken; vgl. 1:14 θεᾶσθαι; 2:4, 7:6 ὥρα; 2:23.24 πιστεύειν; 3:3 ἄνωθεν und γεννᾶσθαι; 3:5-8 πνεῦμα; 3:14, 8:28 ὑψοῦν; 3:17-19 κρίνειν und κρίσις; 6:27.28 ἐργάζεσθαι; 7:8 ἀναβαίνειν; 8:50 ζητεῖν; 9:33 ἐκβάλλειν; 9:39-41 βλέπειν und τυφλός; 10:7 τῶν προβάτων; 11:4 θάνατος; 11:11, 12 κοιμᾶσθαι; 11:23-26 ἀνάστασις und ζωή; 13:1 εἰς τέλος; 14:7 γνώση μετὰ ταῦτα; 14:18 ἔρχομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς; 17:19 ἁγιάζειν; 21:19, 20 ἀκολουθεῖν. (vgl. 1:37).[94]

Several of these are possible only in the Greek. Field in commenting on ἄνωθεν in 3:3[95] seems reluctant to accept "again" in spite of Artemid. Oniror. 1.13, which he quotes, because no example of this use of the word is found in Jn, and because "the Hebrew מלמעלה is always local."

The best evidence for the double meaning in Jn is found in the fact that in the Discourses ἄνωθεν is used in both senses. It occurs in I 30.1 with the meaning "from above" and in the following passage it plainly means "again":

II 17.27 οὐ θέλεις ἀπομαθεῖν, εἰ δυατόν, πάντα ταῦτα καὶ ἄνωθεν ἄρξασθαι...

Ollson insists on the latter meaning in his note on BGU 595, lines 6-7, ἀποδέδωκε αὐτὰς ἄνωθον (=ἄνωθεν).[96]

All this indicates that word-play in Jn favors a Greek rather than a Semitic original.

---

94 Das Johannes Evangelium, l.c.
95 Notes on the Translation of the N.T., p.86f. Cf. Abbott, JG # 1907, where the same statement is made for Aramaic.
96 Papyrusbriefe aus der frütheste Römerzeit, p.135

13. "Living Water"

This phrase, which occurs in Jn 4:11 and 7:38, is Semitic, so Montgomery claims,[97] and he points out that Rev. 7:17 is the only other occurrence in the N.T.

That the phrase does not demand an origin in Aramaic is shown by its occurrence in the Didache:

VII. 1,2 βαπτίσατε εἰς τὸ ὄνομα... ἐν ὕδατι ζῶντι. ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἔχῃς ὕδωρ ζῶν,...

The phrase was common in the O.T., and Bernard cites[98] Canticles 4:15, "where the mystic bride is described as φρέαρ ὕδατος ζῶντος." The most probable explanation of this phrase in Jn may be the influence of the LXX phraseology.[99]

---

97 Origin, p.16.
98 St. John, pp.138-139.
99 For other parallels, cf. Bauer, Das Johannes Evangelium, Exkurs to 4:14, Wörterbuch, s.v. ὕδωρ where a bibliography is given.

CHAPTER II

THE PARTS OF SPEECH

1. Pronouns

a. Relative Pronouns

Burney finds the Semitic use of the indeclinable relative completed by a pronoun in seven passages in Jn:[1]

1:6 ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος... ὄνομα αὐτῷ Ἰωάνης. (cf. 3:1).

1:27 οὗ ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἄξιος ἵνα λύσω αὐτοῦ τὸν ἱμάντα τοῦ ὑποδήματος.

1:33 Ἐφ ὃν ἂν ἴδῃς τὸ πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον καὶ μένον ἐπ' αὐτόν,

9:36 καὶ τίς ἐστιν, κύριε, ἵνα πιστεύσω εἰς αὐτόν;

13:26 Ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν ᾧ ἐγὼ βάψω τὸ ψωμίον καὶ δώσω αὐτῷ.

18:9 οὓς δέδωκάς μοι οὐκ ἀπώλεσα ἐξ αὐτων οὐδένα.

None of these corresponds exactly to Burney's example, "I saw the man who I gave the book to him." The assumption that 1:6 and 3:1 omit a relative is untenable, as the Greek parallels quoted in Chapter I will show.[2] In 9:36 Burney assumes that ἵνα is a mistranslation of the relative ד. In 1:33 the Semitic construction would be much plainer if there were but one participle. It may be noted also that 1:33

---

1 AOFG, p.84; cf. Torrey, Review, p.323.
2. p.31-32.

closely resembles the parallel in Mk 1:7. The most forceful examples are 13:26 and 18:9, although it may be significant that in 13:26 we have a compound predicate, and that in 18:9 the relative comes first in the sentence. The plain Semitic flavor of such a translation as Gen. 6:17 in the LXX, καταφθεῖραι πᾶσαν σάρκα ἐν ᾗ ἐστὶν ἐν αὐτῇ πνεῦμα ζωῆς, is not noticeable in these Johannine passages.[3] Such was Wellhausen's judgement[4] nor does Bauer cite a single Johannine passage in his list of the occurrences of this idiom in the N.T.[5]

Moulton long ago pointed out that this construction had its roots in the classical language.[6] WM cites Xen.Cyr. 1.4.19, Diod. S. 1.97, 17.35, Paus. 2.4.7, Soph. Philoct 316.[7] Radermacher quotes the following examples:[8]

Callimachus Epigr. XLII 3 ὧν ὃ μὲν αὐτῶν εἵλκεν,

Asclepiodotus Tact. I 3 ὃ καὶ δορατοφόρον τοῦτο προσαγορεύεται,

Diodor. I 97,2 (φασὶν) πίθον εἶναι τετρημένον, εἰς ὃν τῶν ἱερέων ἑξήκοντα καὶ τριακοσίους καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν ὕδωρ φέρειν εἰς αὐτὸν ἐκ τοῦ Νείλου.

He then makes the significant observation "Bei Schriftstellern

---

3 Lagrange, S.Jean, l.c., regards 1:33 as the best example; but adds "Encore faut-il noter que le Grec s'en accommode tres bien," and quotes Eur. Or.64.

4 Das Evangelium Johannis, p.135 "Davon aber dass die Rektion des Arthron nach semitischer Weise durch ein Pronomen nachgebraucht wird, findet sich keine Spur; denn ἀπ' αὐτόν 1,33 gehört nur zu μένον und nimmt nicht etwa das den Satz anfangende ἐφ' ὃν wieder auf."

5 Wörterbuch, s.v. ὅς.

6 Prolegomena, pp.94-95; cf. KG II.p.433f.

7 p.185.

die der Volkssprache nahestehen, gehört die Erscheinung zu den gewöhnlichsten."[8] This evidence supports G.R.Driver's contention that this construction was extended to "single-limbed relative clauses" in classical Greek.[9]

The use of the idiom in Hellenistic times is attested by

P Oxy I 117 (Letter ii/iii AD) line 14 ῥάκη δύο κατασεσημημένα [τ]ῇ σφραγεῖδί μου, ἐξ ὧν δώσεις τοῖς παιδίοις σοῦ ἓν ἐξ αὐτῶν.

Thackeray regards its presence in II Macc. 12:37 and I Esdras 3:5, etc., as sufficient warrant for its existence in the Koine.[10] Further evidence in this direction is to be found in the fairly frequent use of this construction in the LXX where the Hebrew does not have it;e.g.,Isa. 1:21.[11]

In Modern Greek, as in English and German, the idiom is very much at home, as Moulton pointed out in his Prolegomena.[12] The completion of the relative by a pronoun is, therefore, native enough to the Greek tongue to make an occasional occurrence of little value as a mark of Semitic influence. Nor do we find any simple and clear-cut examples of this idiom in Jn in the list presented by Burney.[13] Moreover, the presence of the idiom in I Clem 21:9 οὗ ἡ πνοὴ

---

8 Grammatik,p.217.
9 Quoted in MH II iii.,p.435.
10 Grammar of O.T. in Greek,p.46.
11 Cited with this argument by MH l.c.
12 l.c. cf. Pernot, Revue des Etudes grecques 37, pp. 127-129. He gives evidence for its occurrence in French also. For further examples in Hellenistic and Modern Greek cf. Jannaris, op.cit., p.353, # 1439.
13 Those passages which involve mistranslation are

αὐτοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν ἐστίν calls for further caution in drawing conclusions from its occurrence, since here we have a Christian contemporary of the author of the Fourth Gospel using this idiom while writing in Greek.

b. Personal Pronouns

(1) "Anticipating a Genitive"

Burney points out that "it is peculiarly idiomatic in Aramaic to anticipate a genitive by use of a possessive pronominal suffix attached to the antecedent,"[14] and gives examples from the Aramaic of Daniel and the Palestinian Syriac of Jn 1. He finds but one instance of this in Jn, "but this is so striking that it should surely count for much in estimating the theory of translation from Aramaic."[14] The one instance is

Jn 9:18 τοὺς γονεῖς αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἀναβλέψαντος

which Burney translates, "his parents of him that had received sight." As a confirming parallel, he quotes

Mk 6:22 εἰσελθούσης τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτοῦ (v.l. αὐτῆς) τῆς Ἡρωδιάδος

The significance of the fact that there is but one example of this idiom in Jn has been well pointed out by Allis.[15] The genitive construction was, as he says, very common in Greek at this time.[16] Hence knowledge of Greek

---

discussed in detail in Chapter III.

14 AOFG, p.86.
15 PTR, p.550f.
16 Jannaris, An Historical Greek Grammar, # 1399, says

would <u>not</u> have acted as a strong enough deterrent to eliminate all the other occurrences of this common Semitic idiom. Allis has indicated the frequency of the construction in Semitic usage::"it occurs 14 times in the Pesh. of Jn 1 and 16 times in the Pal. Syr. of the same chapter."[17] The single occurrence in Jn is due not to an inability to use a fairly common Semitic idiom, but to ability to use a fairly uncommon Greek idiom.

For, although the αὐτός may be intensive, a construction too common to demand the citation of examples, it is more probable that the τοῦ ἀναβλέψαντος is an explanatory parenthesis in apposition with αὐτου. Such a construction was not strange to classical Greek. Gildersleeve, in the course of his discussion of the use of the article,[18] quotes among others the following examples: And.3,41;1,6;1,139; Hom. Il. 22,59.

The construction occurs in an equal variety of cases in Hellenistic Greek, the use in the genitive often exactly meeting Burney's description of Jn 9:18:

P Oxy III 480 (Census Returns 157 AD) line 2

[οι]κ(ίαν) καὶ χρηστ(ηρία) πρότ(ερον) α[ὐ(τοῦ)] πατρός μ[ο]υ

P Oxy III 498 (Contract with Stone-cutters ii AD)

---

that the Greek of this period exhibits "a fondness for a frequent use of personal and possessive pronouns...which soon led to an accumulation of unemphatic pronouns, in particular of the oblique cases of the 3d person, and above all of the genitive..."

17 PTR, l.c.

18 Greek Syntax ii. 279.

line 7f.

εἰς οἰκίαν σου τῆς Ἀντωνίας

P Oxy III 513 (Receipt for Sale 184 AD) line 24

ἐπὶ ὑπογραφῆς μου τοῦ Διογένους

P Teb II 374 (Lease of Crown Land 131 AD) line 15f.

ἀπηλιώτου ἐμοῦ τοῦ Τιθοείους γῆι

In Epict.IV 1.134 a similar use with the dative case is found, and in IV.1.47 the appositional and intensive uses are merged.

These occasional Greek parallels seem a much better explanation of Jn 9:18, than the very frequent occurrences of that Aramaic usage cited by Burney.

(2) Anticipating The Direct Object

Burney notes as a "peculiarly Aramaic idiom"[19] the anticipation of the direct object of a verb by a pronominal suffix, quoting three examples of it from the Pal. Syr. of Jn 19:13-34, and claiming

Jn 19:13 Ἄγουσιν αὐτὸν πρὸς τοὺς φαρισαίους τόν ποτε τυφλόν.

He states that there are no examples of this construction in Biblical Aramaic, and only a few in Hebrew. Moreover, in none of the examples he quotes is the suffix separated from the direct object it anticipates.

This construction is very much like that discussed above. Like it only one instance is found in Jn, although

---

19 AOFG, p.86.

this also seems to be a frequent idiom in Syriac, and the argument of Allis would apply here with practically the same force.

The occurrence of such a construction in classical Greek was discussed on p.48; to that discussion may be added the statement of KG:[20]

> Die Personalpronomen und die Demonstrativpronomen stehen oft in enger Beziehung zu einem folgenden Substantive, indem sie entweder nachdrücklich darauf hinweisen und es gleichsam vorbereiten oder darin als in einer epexegetischen Apposition ihre nachträgliche Erklärung finden."

It gives numerous examples, several being object of a verb, although in most of these cases the object precedes the verb. Jannaris speaks of this construction as a "rather frequent practice" in the Greek language after 300 AD.[21]

The existence of the construction in Hellenistic Greek is proven by both the papyri and Epictetus. In the former such a formula as the following

P Fay 106 (Petition 140 AD) line 15 ὅθεν ἀξιῶ σαὶ τὸν σω[τῆρα] ἐλεῆσαί με

is fairly common in petitions. Cf. P Lond II 177 (Petition 40-41 BC) line 23. A closer parallel to Jn 9:13 occurs in

P Oxy II 281 (Complaint against a Husband 20-50 AD) line 9f. ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν ἐπιδεξαμένη αὐτὸν εἰς τὰ τῶν γονέων μου οἰκτήρια λειτὸν παντελῶς ὄντα...

Epictetus frequently uses as object of a verb τινά completed

---

20 §469,3. 21 op.cit., §1401.

by a participle; e.g.,

II 13.5 ὅταν ἴδω τινὰ φοβούμενον

cf. II 13.12;12.3;etc. He also employs the personal pronouns similarly, cf. I 7.25;25.16; II 18.22;24.12;etc. In both of these cases, it is usually impossible to stress the appositional nature of the participial phrase. But in the following cases the relationship is the same as in Jn 9:13:

III 24.117...ἢ ὁρδινατίων δήξεταί σε ἢ οἱ ἐπιθύοντες ἐν τῷ Καπιτωλίῳ ἐπὶ τοῖς ὀπτίκοις τὸν τηλικαύτην ἀρχὴν παρὰ τὸν Διὸς εἰληφότα;

cf. IV 7.20; III 1.12. A further instance of the separation of substantives in apposition occurs in P Fay 114 (Letter from Gemellus 100 AD) line 5f.

That the phrase attacked in the Gospel would have a familiar sound to Greek ears is shown by P Fay 110 (Letter from Gemellus 94 AD) line 21f. Χα[ιρᾶ]ν [τό]ν ποτε πράκτορα... καὶ Ἡρωνᾶ τόν ποτε ἡγούμ(ενον).

The solitary instance in Jn of this none-too-frequent Greek idiom cannot bear much weight as evidence for the Aramaic original of the Gospel.

(3) Unemphatic Personal Pronouns of the 1st & 2d Person

Montgomery regards the "constant use of the personal pronoun" as "due in large part to the Aramaic participial construction which generally required a pronoun."[22] Torrey

---

22 Origin, p.19.

makes much the same statement, claiming that "this is one of the most striking and certain Aramaisms in John."[23] Wellhausen noted this use in Jn and saw the confirmation of its unemphatic nature in the fact that αὐτός was combined with these separate personal pronouns when emphasis was desired. In his opinion, however, the source of the idiom was "der Vulgärsprache...Jedenfalls nicht aus der Aramäischen, denn er ist nicht wie dort auf das Präsens beschränkt."[24] But Burney, who holds the same view as Montgomery and Torrey, argues that the Aramaic use is not limited to the participle but is found also with Perfect or Imperfect; and he gives a long list of unemphatic pronouns of the first and second persons in Jn which are due to the translation of the corresponding unemphatic pronoun in the Aramaic.[25]

The use of separate personal pronouns in Jn goes beyond their use in classical Greek. Yet even there, the use of separate personal pronouns did not always mean special emphasis. "The emphasis of the first and second persons is not to be insisted on too much in poetry or in familiar prose. Notice the frequency of ἐγώ οἶδα, ἐγὼ εἰμι. Noteworthy also is the return of ἐγώ in Aeschin.3."[26] Ebeling recognizes the unemphatic use in the phrases ἦν δ'ἐγώ and ἔφην ἐγώ "and in many other cases", quoting as an example Protag. 360d.[27] Moulton carries on this argument by asking, "Are we obliged

---

23 Review, p.322.
24 Das Evangelium Johannis, p.141f.
25 AOTG, p.80f. 26 Gildersleeve, Greek Syntax i., p.35
27 Ebeling, Gildersleeve Studies, p.240

to see a special stress in the pronoun whenever it denotes the Master, like the Pythagorean αὐτὸς ἔφα? We may perhaps better describe it as fairly represented to the eye by the capital in 'He'...Generally the pronoun is unmistakably emphatic in nom. from Mt 1:21 onwards; but occasionally the force of the emphasis is not obvious."[28]

This unemphatic usage, and in particular that use not noted by Moulton of the unemphatic "I" of the teacher is quite common in Epictetus. In the following passage, in which he is arguing for the good intentions of the gods, there is no direct contrast between him and any other teacher; the amount of emphasis upon the ἐγώ would have to be weighed in a very fine scales indeed:

I 1.8 ἆρά γε ὅτι οὐκ ἤθελον; ἐγὼ μὲν δοκῶ ὅτι, εἰ ἠδύναντο, κἀκεῖνα ἂν ἡμῖν ἐπέτρεψαν·

The thing that is stressed is very obviously not the "I" but the impossibility. So in the following passage the emphasis falls upon the ταύτην that precedes the ἐγώ,

I 5.9-10 καὶ τὸ λογικὸν οὐκ ἀποτέτμηται ἀλλ' ἀποτεθηρίωται. ταύτην ἐγὼ δύναμιν εἴπω; μὴ γένοιτο,

The use of ἐγῷμαι claimed as unemphatic by Gildersleeve is paralleled by I 9.10 Ἐγὼ μὲν οἶμαι, ὅτι... which begins a new paragraph, implies no contrast, and serves simply to introduce the important statement of the teacher. The same

---

28 Prolegomena, p.85f. cf. the quotation from Jannaris made on p.47f., footnote 16.

thing is true in I 10.7 and throughout the Discourses.

Much more infrequently he uses ἡμεῖς without appreciable emphasis; e.g.,

I 24.3 Καὶ νῦν ἡμεῖς γε εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην κατάσκοπον πέμπομεν.

The translators find no special emphasis here.

Epictetus has a way also of using σύ of an imaginary opponent without much emphasis on the pronoun;e.g.,

I 4.13 Σύ οὖν ἐνταῦθά μοι δεῖξόν σου τὴν προκοπήν.

This Σύ has not appeared before, is an imaginary opponent, and at the end of the paragraph has become plural. So in

I 12.31 προσάγεταί σοι τὰ κατάλληλα τῇ δυνάμει ἣν ἔχεις· σὺ δ' αὐτὴν τότε μάλιστα ἀποστρέφεις,...

This follows a series of verbs in the 2d person singular without σύ and no distinction of emphasis is discernible.

If the use of αὐτός in conjunction with the personal pronouns is a proof of their unemphatic nature in Jn, the same thing is true of Epictetus. Schenkl lists passages in which αὐτός is used with ἐγώ, σύ, ἡμεῖς, and ὑμεῖς.[29] In the two following passages from the papyri, αὐτός reinforces ἐγώ : P Oxy II 294 (Letter 22 AD) line 13f.; P Oxy II 298 (Letter i AD) col.II,line 52.

The use of the personal pronouns without emphasis is fairly frequent in the papyri; e.g.,

P Oxy IX 1216 (Letter of Sarapas ii/iii AD) line 30

.

---

29 "Index Verborum" s.v.

ἀἰγὼ εὔχομαι... σὺ οἶδας...γράφω..σὺ δὲ οὐκ ἠξίωσας...

P Oxy I 113 (Letter ii AD) line 30 περὶ δὲ καὶ σὺ ὧν θέλεις δήλου μοι ἡδέως ποήσοντι.

In spite of the use of unemphatic personal pronouns in Epictetus, Jn uses the separate pronouns more than twice as frequently as the Stoic preacher does. Does the explanation lie in the fact that the wide use of the Aramaic participle led to the use of many more unemphatic pronouns in Jn than in Epictetus? Not at all. A careful survey of the passages in Jn in which these separate pronouns occur will convince one that they are almost all emphatic.[30]

In the number of unemphatic uses Jn and Epictetus are very close together, but Epictetus lacks the sharp contrasts, the bitter polemic, and the heavy insistence that loads most of the pronouns in Jn with emphasis. The largest numbers of separate pronouns occur in chapters where Jesus is sharply set off from some individual or group. They are found in thick clusters in his controversies with the Jews; they are frequent in Jesus' revelation of his own significance to his disciples; but ἐγώ occurs but once after the 18th chapter. In other words, there is no "constant use of the personal pro-

---

30 Lagrange, S.Jean, p.cxiv. (in speaking of Burney's plea) says, "l'argument est ingenieux, mais il est bien difficile de signaler des cas ou le pronom n'a pas une certaine importance voulue: on peut dire qu'elle est toujours dans le ton de l'evangile; cf. x.17.27.28 pris au hasard parmi les examples ou Burney ne voit pas d'emphase speciale." cf. for a similar protest W.E.Barnes, "AOFG by C.F.Burney", JTS XXIII (1922) 420, who adds 18:37 and 19:7 to the "emphatic" list, and feels that "Dr. Burney lacks caution in his denial of emphasis."

noun through the book" as Montgomery claims.[31] The distinctive characteristic of Jn's use of personal pronouns is the extremely large number of emphatic personal pronouns. The example taken "at hazard" by Montgomery from a saying of John the Baptist,

3:28 ὅτι εἶπον [ἐγώ] Οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ὁ χριστός,

where the first [ἐγώ] is an "apparently superfluous pronoun," is very similar to another declaration of the Baptist:

1:30 ὑπὲρ οὗ ἐγὼ εἶπον

which BD quotes as an example of emphatic usage of the pronoun.[32] The connection of the use of separate personal pronouns in Jn with Aramaic idiom does not seem very obvious.

c. Demonstrative Pronouns

(1) Frequency

Burney's argument runs as follows:

> To express the 3rd person αὐτός is fairly frequent in John. The figures for αὐτός (-ή) as subject in the four gospels are as follows: Mt.12, Mk.17, Lk.31, Jn.18. Much more often, however, John prefers to use an emphatic demonstrative οὗτος 'this one', ἐκεῖνος 'that one', and he employs these pronouns substantively with far greater freedom than do the Synoptists; the figures for οὗτος (αὕτη) as subject are Mt. 35, Mk.14, Lk.36, Jn.44. For ἐκεῖνος (-η,-ο) used substantively whether as subject or obliquely, the figures are Mt.4, Mk. 3, Lk.4, Jn.51...John's extraordinary fondness for demonstratives in preference to Personal Pronouns finds adequate explanation in the theory that his gospel is a close reproduction of an Aramaic original.[33]

This is true, so Burney claimed, because Aramaic is richly supplied with demonstrative pronouns.

---

31 Origin, l.c. 32 # 277,1. 33 AOFG, p.82f.

Jn's "extraordinary fondness" for demonstratives is not to be explained on the basis of his colloquial, vulgar style. For in several hundred papyri, the occurrences of these three pronouns are grouped in a proportion closer to that of the Synoptists than to that of Jn. The totals are αὐτός 69, οὗτος 49, ἐκεῖνος 8. Of course individual papyri do present more demonstratives than personal pronouns. But, in general, the evidence of the papyri lends little support to Jn's usage.

Epictetus, however, would have seen nothing extraordinary in Jn's fondness for demonstratives. In a section of his Discourses approximately the length of Jn, the totals for the three pronouns are as follows: αὐτός 16, οὗτος 76, ἐκεῖνος 64. When Jn's figures (αὐτός 18, οὗτος 44, ἐκεῖνος 51) are set beside these, it is evident at a glance that Epictetus' usage is more "extraordinary" in every case than Jn's. It does not take a rich supply of demonstrative pronouns in Aramaic to explain a Greek usage in Jn which is so well supported by Epictetus.

(2) Ἐκεῖνος With Personal Force

Montgomery remarks the use of the demonstrative ἐκεῖνος in Jn 19:35. This use, he says, is not strange to the Aramaist, since "the Aramaic would be hu yada, which means 'he-or that one-is knowing', the one pronoun being both personal and demonstrative."[34]

---

34 Origin, pp.19-20.

It is interesting to note that when Burney is explaining the extreme frequency of ἐκεῖνος and οὗτος in Jn[35] he never equates ἐκεῖνος with hu yada.

Jannaris' statement that ἐκεῖνος may be substituted "according to the nature of the case and in conformity with the individual force"of the pronoun for the emphatic nominative of the third person αὐτός, would lead us to expect uses similar to that of Jn 19:35 in Greek. Such instances are found; Walter Bauer remarks the use of ἐκεῖνος for αὐτός,[36] and cites Thucyd. 1,32,5. Xen. Cyrop. 4,5,20. Lysias 14,28 as examples. KG states that ἐκεῖνος often refers to a preceding substantive or personal pronoun, and that in such cases it indicates no more than the third person.[37]

The same substitution is found in Hellenistic Greek, and is quite frequent in the Discourses of Epictetus; e.g.,

I 29.18 τίνι προ[σ]χῶμεν; σοὶ ἢ αὐτῷ; καὶ τί λέγει ἐκεῖνος;

II 8.11 σὺ ἀπόσπασμα εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ· ἔχεις ἐν σεαυτῷ μέρος ἐκείνου.

III 24.114 οὐχὶ δ' ὅλος πρὸς τὸν θεὸν τέταμαι καὶ τὰς ἐκείνου ἐντολὰς καὶ τὰ προστάγματα

II 6.8[38] μὴ γὰρ σὸν τοῦτο[τὸ] ἔργον ἦν; ἀλλ' ἐκείνου.

P Lond III 897 col.II,lines 1-2 λαογραφίας τοτε γαρ ελασσωθεις υπο του προοντος κωμογραμματεως

---

35 ΔCFG, p.84. 36 Wörterbuch, s.v. 37 KG # 467,12

38 Oldfather translates ἐκεῖνος in each of these passages by the pronoun of the third person.

ἐκ[ε]ινος μεν [τ]οτε εψευσατο.[39]

These parallels are sufficient to indicate that in Greek usage ἐκεῖνος might be used with demonstrative or personal force.

2. The Verb

a. λέγω, "speak-of" or "mean"

This is another of those usages which Montgomery[40] calls "Semitic-looking cases;" he finds amar so used in Jud. 7:4, and λέγω in two Johannine passages:

8:27 οὐκ ἔγνωσαν ὅτι τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῖς ἔλεγεν.

6:70 καὶ ἐξ ὑμῶν εἷς διάβολός ἐστιν. ἔλεγεν δὲ τὸν Ἰούδαν Σίμωνος Ἰσκαριώτου.

This is good classical usage. The discussion in LS[41] is sufficient proof of this:

> Like Latin dicere, to speak of, mean, refer to, Hdt. 7. 144; πῶς δὴ οὖν αὐτὰ λέγεις; how do you mean? Plat. Phaedr. 265C; καίτοι τί λέγω; but what am I saynng? Ar. Eccl. 298 ἢ πῶς λέγομεν; or what do we mean to say? Plat. Gorg. 480B, etc...in Att., to explain more fully εἶσω κορίζου σύ, Καλάνδραν, λέγω you, I mean Cassandra, Aesch. Ag. 1035 ὁ μάντις. υἱὸν Οἰκλέους λ. Id. Theb. 609, cf. 658, Pr. 946; etc.

Attention may be called to a close parallel to Jn 8:27 which is given in another connection by Smyth:[42]

Plato, Gorgias, 503C εἰ ἔστιν, ἣ σὺ πρότερον ἔλεγες, ἀρετήν, ἀληθής.

which he translates, "if the virtue of which you were speaking

---

39 Ollson, Papyrusbriefe aud der früheste Römerzeit, p.144, translates, "...Da lag er..."

40 Origin, p.16.

41 s.v. λέγω.

42 Greek Grammar, p.358.

before, is real."

This use of εἰμί is as much at home in the writings of Epictetus as it was in the writings of his predecessors:

II 8.13 δοκεῖς με λέγειν ἀργυροῦν τινα ἢ χρυσοῦν ἔξωθεν;

II 12.20 'ποῖον καὶ λέγεις;' 'Τὸ αὐτοῖς νὴ Δία τούτοις χρώμενον καὶ δοκιμάζον ἕκαστον καὶ βουλευόμενον.' 'ἆρά γε τὴν ψυχὴν λέγεις;' 'ὀρθῶς ὑπέλαβες. Ταύτην γάρ τοι καὶ λέγω.'

IV 1.66 πῶς λέγεις;[43]

cf. also II 8.4; I 29.16; III 22.76; IV 1.99; etc.

Instances of this use, though not as frequent as in literary Greek, also appear in the papyri:

P Fay 110 (Letter of Gemellus 94 AD) line 6 ὃ λέγεις τὸ μέ[ί]ον[44]

The construction was obviously Greek usage in good standing in the days when the Fourth Gospel was written.

b. εἰμί, "there is"

"The indeclinable ith, which denotes abstract existence, anglice 'there is'," seems to Montgomery to lie behind "the extraordinarily large use of the verb 'to be' in the Gospel."[45]

Such an assumption, however, fails to take into account that the Greek language used εἰμί both as a copula and to denote abstract existence. Gildersleeve says,

---

43 Oldfather trans. in each case "mean" or "speak of".
44 MM, Vocab., s.v. λέγω. 45 Origin, p.19.

"Strictly speaking the copula is itself a predicate, as is not unfrequently shown by the translation when it stands alone or with an adverb,"[46] and he quotes Dem. (58),16; And. 1,120; Soph. Ph. 1241. And Bauer describes one of the uses of εἰμί as equivalent to es gibt.[47]

This use of "to be" is quite common in Hellenistic Greek; it frequently occurs in the Discourses; e.g.,

I 15.4 ἐν πάσῃ περιστάσει τηρήσω τὸ ἡγεμονικὸν κατὰ φύσιν ἔχον - Τὸ τίνος; - Τὸ ἐκείνου ἐν ᾧ εἰμί.

I 12.1 Περὶ θεῶν οἱ μὲν τινές εἰσιν οἱ λέγοντες μηδ' εἶναι τὸ θεῖον

II 20.23 λάβε τὰ ἐναντία· ὅτι [θεοὶ] οὔτ' εἰσίν, εἴ τε καὶ εἰσίν...

cf. I 22.15; 12.5,16; III 24.102; and

P Oxy III 465 (Astrological Calendar ii AD) col.I, line 21 ἔσται πόλεμος ἀνδιὰ μάχη

P Teb II 272 (Medical Fragment ii AD) line 3f. ἐν δὲ [τοῖ]ς τῆς ἐπιδόσεως χρόνοις πλεί[σ]ται ⟨αἱ⟩τιδι τῆς προφορᾶς εἰσιν.

The verb "to be" is used much more frequently in Jn than in Epictetus or the papyri in general.

Montgomery in a rather involved argument pleads for the value of Aramaic as showing the difference in meaning between the ἐγώ εἰμι in Jn 8:58, "I am", and in 8:24, where it means "It is I".[48] Yet, as he admits, the contexts

---

46 Greek Syntax i., p.31.
47 Wörterbuch, s.v. εἰμί.
48 Origin, l.c.

leave no doubt as to the difference in meaning; and it is, of course, by reasoning from the obvious difference of meaning in the two Greek passages that he arrives at the different forms of Aramaic that lie behind them. But since this is so, how can it be said that the Aramaic shows the difference? Of course the verb "to be" carried both meanings in Greek; e.g.,

Epict. IV 1.167 εἰ δ'ἐγὼ καὶ σὺ ἦμεν

which Mrs. Carter translates, "But if it had been you or I."

It seems reasonable to believe that the Greek use of "to be" to express abstract existence, as a copula, and to denote identity is a better explanation of the frequency of in Jn, than the use of two or three constructions in Aramaic which could be translated by the one Greek verb.

c.Impersonal Use of Plural Verb

This construction is mentioned by Montgomery as a "Semitic-looking case,"[49] in connection with Jn 12:16:-

ἀλλ' ὅτε ἐδοξάσθη Ἰησοῦς τότε ἐμνήσθησαν ὅτι ταῦτα ἦν ἐπ' αὐτῷ γεγραμμένα καὶ ταῦτα ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ

Moulton notes also Jn 15:6 and 20:2;[50] and Lagrange finds this use only in 15:6.[51]

There is no doubt that an impersonal plural of verbs of saying was quite common in classical Greek. Gildersleeve says that this idiom is found "chiefly in verbs of saying and thinking," and cites passages from Dem.,Xen.,Ar.,Pind.,Soph.,

---

49 Origin, p.16.
50 Prolegomena,pp.58-59.
51 S. Jean,p.cxii.

and Hom., in which the third person plural of a verb of saying is used impersonally.[52]

The same usage is common in Hellenistic Greek. Examples of it are found in the papyri;e.g., P Fay 111 (Letter 95-96 AD) line 14; P Oxy III 472 (Speech of an Advocate 130 AD); as also in Epict. I 7.3;17.15; II 8.24.

In regard to the use of this construction with verbs other than verbs of saying, which is the case in Jn, MH is inclined to admit the Semitic nature of the construction: "since this use is uncommon."[53] Gildersleeve quotes the following passages from classical authors:[54]

Plato Legg. 803D οἴονται...ἡγοῦνται

Id. Rpb. 428B οὐ γὰρ που ἀμαθίᾳ γε ἀλλ' ἐπιστήμῃ εὖ βουλεύονται.

Thuc. 7,69,2 ὅπερ πάσχουσιν ἐν τοῖς μεγάλοις ἀγῶσι.

Hdt. 2,106 τῇ τε ἐκ τῆς Ἐφεσίης ἐς Φώκαιαν ἔρχονται.

Moulton follows Lightfoot in quoting[55]

Eurip. I T 1359 κλέπτουτες ἐκ γῆς ξόανα καὶ θυηπόλους.

A considerable number of instances occur in Hellenistic Greek; e.g.,

P Oxy I 119 (Letter of Theon) line 12 πεπλεύνκαν ἡμῶς ἐκε[ῖ], τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ιβ ὅτι ἔπλευσες.

P Fay 117 (Letter 108 AD) line 8 πέμσις ἡμῖν εἰς ὦκον ἀτυμανῶ καὶ ἐλᾶν ἐπὶ οὗ ἔχουσι ἐλᾶν νέαν εἰς οἶκον.

---

52 Greek Syntax i.,p.41.
53 II iii.p.448.
54 Greek Syntax,l.c.
55 Prolegomena,l.c.

Epict.IV 11.21 πάλιν περὶ Διογένους ταῦτὰ γράφουσι.

Epict. I 4.32 ἀλλ' ὅτι μὲν ἄμπελον ἔδωκαν ἢ πυρούς, ἐπιθύομεν τούτου ἕνεκα, ὅτι δὲ τοιοῦτον ἐξ-ήνεγκαν καρπὸν ἐν ἀνθρωπίνῃ διανοίᾳ ... δείξειν ἡμῖν ἤμελλον...

And R. McKenna[56] notes that Pallis has preserved the idiom in each of the passages in Jn cited above, in his translation of the Gospels into Modern Greek.

d. Tense

(1) Present for Future

This use occurs in Jn 29 times, according to Burney,[57] who sees in it a translation of the Aramaic participle used as a Futurum instans. This use is very frequent in Aramaic, as in Hebrew, and the number of occurrences in Jn seems to him, therefore, to be significant. Twenty-six of the twenty-nine instances occur with the verb ἔρχομαι e.g.,

14:3 πάλιν ἔρχομαι.

The other three instances are

1:29 Ἴδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν...

12:25 ὁ φιλῶν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπολλύει αὐτήν

17:20 περὶ τῶν πιστευόντων διὰ τοῦ λόγου αὐτῶν

Several facts should be noted about these examples: first, the almost complete limitation of this idiom in Jn to the verb ἔρχομαι; second, the classification of the non-ἔρχομαι passages under this heading depends to some ex-

---

56 cf. MH II iii.,p.448. 57 AOFG, pp.94-95.

tent upon the interpretation placed upon Jn's gospel as a whole.

But aside from these considerations, Jn's usage would not grate upon the classicist's ear. Burton says of this construction that"it is recognized by all grammarians."[58] KG remarks that the present of verbs of going, such as ἔρχομαι, πορεύομαι,...are not seldom used in a future sense, citing Σ 136.β 238. X.An.7.1,31. Ar.R.197, and Xen.Cyrop.7.1,20.[59] Goodwin's description of classical usage might have been written for Jn: "In animated language the present often refers to the future, to express <u>likelihood</u>, <u>intention</u>, or <u>danger</u>."[60] His examples are from Thuc. and Dem., and he quotes Lys. xii. 14 for the use of ἀπόλλυμαι with future force.[61]

This usage is fairly common in the Greek of the Roman period. Twice, Epictetus uses a compound of ἔρχομαι in the present tense as a future, coordinating it with a future:

I 25.18 Καπνὸν πεποίηκεν ἐν τῷ οἰκήματι; ἂν μέτριον, μενῶ· ἂν λίαν πολύν, ἐξέρχομαι.

I 29.27 εἰ μηκέτι χρείαν ἔχητέ μου ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ, ἐξέρχομαι. ἂν πάλιν σχῆτε, εἰσελεύσομαι.

But the use of the vivid present for future is not limited to the verbs of going in the Discourses; e.g.,

IV 1.47 ἐλθὲ εἰς τὸ μέσον καὶ εἰπὲ ἡμῖν, πότερα χώτερον ἐκαθεύδες, νῦν ἢ πρὶν...; εὐθὺς ἀκούεις ὅτι...

---

58 <u>Moods & Tenses</u>, pp.9-10.
59 # 382,6.
60 <u>Moods & Tenses</u>, p.11.
61 cf. KG # 382,5a.

IV 1.132 καλεῖ σε ὁ τύραννος ἐροῦντά τι ὧν οὐ πρέπει σοι· λέγεις ἢ οὐ λέγεις;

I 17.28 ἐὰν θέλῃς, ἐλεύθερος εἶ· ἐὰν θέλῃς, μέμψῃ οὐδένα, ἐγκαλέσεις οὐδενί, πάντα κατὰ γνώμην ἔσται.

I 19.27 'Ἀλλ' οἱ τὰς [φ]ωνάς, φησί, γράφοντες γράψουσι τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα.' – Μή τι οὖν σὺ τοῖς ἀναγιγνώσκουσι λέγεις παρών· ἐμὲ γεγράφασιν;'

The same thing is true of the usage of the papyri; e.g.,

P Lond II 306 (Appointment of a Deputy Collector 145 AD) line 15 ἔτι δὲ κα[ὶ κ]ατα χωρεῖ ὁ Σατορνίλος τὰ τῆς τάξεως βιβλία ταῖς ἐξ ἔθους προθεσμίαις.

to which passage the editor adds the note: "Lines 15-16 δὲ κτλ. i.e. Satornilus shall hand over (present for future, as in lines 9 and 11) the accounts of the tax."

P Teb II 412 (Letter 11 AD) lines 3-4 καλῶς ποιήσις ἄνελθε εἰς τὴν μητρόπολιν τοῦ νέου ἔτους ἐπὶ καὶγὼ ἀνέρχομαι εἰς τὴν πόλιν.

P Oxy III 528 (Letter 11 AD) line 24 ἔρχῃ [εἴτε] οὐκ ἔρχῃ δήλωσόν μοι,

which is the appeal of a husband to an estranged wife, asking about her return. So in P Oxy X 1291 (Letter 30 AD) line 5f. Ollson translates two presents: γίνεται and ὑπάγει, as futures. Cf. P Oxy I 113 (Letter 11 AD) line 28 ἐξέρχομαι, and the following frequent promise in legal documents occurs at times with a present; e.g.,

P Oxy II 272 (Transfer of a Debt 66 AD) line 23f.

καὶ οὐδὲν ἐνκαλῶ καθὼς πρόκειται.

This evidence goes with Lagrange's judgement that this use of the present tense is not to be regarded as a Semitism.[62]

Of the two examples of the participle used in the present tense for the future which were quoted on p.64, Montgomery notes only Jn 17:20, for which he finds parallels in Acts 2:47 τοὺς σωζομένους, and Dan.2:13.[63]

Burton describes this use of the Present Participle as closely analogous to the use of the present indicative discussed above.[64]

In the papyri this use of the present participle is found quite frequently. It has been noted by the editor of

P Lond II 306 (Appointment of a Deputy Collector 145 AD) line 4f. ομολογει Στοτοητις... τον ομολογουντα συνεστακεναι [9] τον Σα[το]ενιλον πραικτορευοντα απο του ισιοντος[10] θς Αν-τ[ωνιν]ου Καισαρος του Κυριου εφ ετη δυω[11]κα δια[γρα]φοντα... επιβαλλον in a footnote to line 15: "present for future, as in lines 9 and 11." And Ollson[65] calls attention to the same construction in

P Strassb. II 1173 line 4f. [Διό] ἐρωτῶ σε καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν [καὶ Βάσσο]υ καταλογὴν δοῦναι ὄνους [τοὺς φερουν]τας τὰ ξύλα in a note on τοὺς φέροντας : "Präsens f. Fururum." Cf. also P Oxy II 245 (Registration of Cattle 26 AD) line 10, and P Oxy II 244 (Transfer of Cattle 23 AD) line 9.

One passage in Epictetus that is somewhat parallel

---

62 S.Jean, p.cxii.
63 Origin, p.18
64 Moods and Tenses, p.58f.
65 Papyrusbriefe aus der früheste Römerzeit, p.206

may be noted:

II 16.14 τηλικαύτας ἔχων χεῖρας ἔτι ζητεῖς τὸν ἀπομύξοντα;

This construction, therefore, would seem to be no more frequent in Jn than in Hellenistic Greek.

(2) Frequent Historic Present Tense

Burney's argument that this is due to translation of the Aramaic participle runs as follows: The historic present occurs more frequently in Mk and Jn than in Mt and Lk. In Mk, 50% of the instances occur with verbs of saying; in Jn, 75%. The frequency of the Aramaic participle is shown by its occurrence 99 times in the 199 1/2 Aramaic verses of Dan, more than half of these are verbs of saying. "Theodotion sometimes renders it by an historic present or (more frequently) by an imperfect;...In other cases he employs an aorist." Allen[66] and Wellhausen[67] have maintained that the frequent use of the historic present in Mk is due to Aramaic influence. Therefore, "it can hardly be doubted that in Jn. also the same theory offers an adequate explanation of the same phenomenon."[68]

Montgomery is more cautious in his statement: "How far the constant lively use of the present tense, e.g., at large in cc. iv. xix., is due to a possibility of good Greek idiom or how far to the tradition of the equally lively Ara-

---

66 Expositor, 1900 pp.463ff.; Expos. Times xiii 329; Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem, p.295.

67 Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien^2, p.17.

68 AOFG, pp.87-90.

maic participle, I cannot decide."[69]

To avoid confusion, we will first consider the possibility of its being good Greek idiom, and later the possibility of its translating the Aramaic participle. Montgomery's suspicion that the frequent use of the historic present might be good Greek idiom is confirmed by KG's statement of the case:

So verwendet auch die griechische Sprache, und zwar häufiger als die übrigen verwandten Sprachen, das Präsens historicum in Haupt- und Nebensätzen ebensowohl bei besonderer Lebhaftigkeit der Darstellung als bei dem schlichten Erzählungstone. Th.1,136 das ganze Kap., ebenso 137. Oft neben Aoristen oder Imperfekten zur hervorhebung einzelner besonders bemerkenswerter und für die Folge wichtiger Momente. (Exx. from Hdt.,Th.,Xen., and others.)[70]

Das Präsens bezeichnet Handlungen, die zwar der Vergangenheit angehören, aber in ihren Wirkungen noch im Augenblicke des Sprechens fortdauern: a) bei dem Verben Wahrnehmung und des Sagens...S.E 1.347...X.An.3.2,8 τὴν μὲν τῶν βαρβάρων ἐπιορκίαν τε καὶ ἀπιστίαν λέγει μὲν Κλεάνωρ, ἐπίστασθε δὲ καὶ ὑμᾶς . . . . . ., Kleanor sagt (wie ihr eben gehört habt). etc.[71]

Thackeray, taking the first three books of each of the four leading historians,finds the historical present in Herod. 206 times, Thuc. 218, Xen. 61, Polyb. 40. "Thus in the classical age it was common to the literary style and to the vernacular, whereas in Hellenistic it was increasingly regarded as vernacular."[72]

This change in attitude may explain why the historical

---

69 Origin,p.18. 70 # 382,2. 71 # 382,4.
72 The LXX and Jewish Worship,p.20f.; for further exx. from classical Greek and for discussion of the manner of its use there, cf. Goodwin, Moods and Tenses,p.11; Gildersleeve, Greek Syntax i.,pp.85-86; Moulton, Prolegomena,pp.120-121; BD # 321.

present is so infrequent in Epictetus, but the more probable reason is that there is so little narrative in his Discourses. When we find a short narrative, it usually contains historic presents, especially of λέγω and φημί; e.g.,

I 25.12 τί οὖν ὁ Ἐπαφρόδιτος; κατεγέλασεν ὡς ὑμεῖς; οὐ· ἀλλ' ἐπιθαυμάσας λέγει 'τάλας, πῶς οὖν ἐσιώπας, πῶς ἐκαρτέρεις;'

I 29.65 καὶ γὰρ Σωκράτης συνεγίγνωσκεν τῷ ἐπὶ τῆς φυλακῆς κλάοντι, ὅτε ἔμελλεν πίνειν τὸ φάρμακον, καὶ λέγει 'ὡς γενναίως ἡμᾶς ἀποδεδάκρυεν.'

I 1.28-30 ἀπηγγέλη αὐτῷ ὅτι Κρίνῃ ἐν συγκλήτῳ.- 'Ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ.' ἀλλὰ ἦλθεν ἡ πέμπτη (ταῦτα δ' εἰώθει γυμνασάμενος ψυχρολουτρεῖν)· 'ἀπέλθωμεν καὶ γυμνάσθωμεν.' γυμνασαμένῳ λέγει τις αὐτῷ ἐλθὼν ὅτι 'κατακέκρισαι.'- 'Φυγῇ', φησίν, 'ἢ θανάτῳ;'—

The small amount of narrative discredits to some extent the following figures, yet they have a certain significance. From I 26 to II 16, Epictetus uses the various tenses of λέγω and φημί as follows: present 55 times, imperfect 5, aorist 1, future 4. Not all, nor even a majority, of these presents are historical presents, but a fair number of them are, and the predominance of the present tense is characteristic of Epictetus.

Examples of the historical present can also be garnered from the papyri. They, however, no more than Epictetus, furnish a proper hunting ground for historical presents, the amount of narrative being relatively slight.

But historical presents are found in the narratives of law suits,etc.; e.g.,

P Oxy III 472 (Speech of an Advocate 130 AD) col.III, line 46 ἐδεήθη ἡ Διονυσία τῆς μητρὸς μὴ ἐπὶ μόνοις αὐτὴν ἀπολιπεῖν τοῖς διαταγῆναι φθάσασιν ἀλλά τι καὶ παρασχεῖν τοῖς μόνῳ σαλεύουσαν, καὶ ἡ μὲν Ἑρμιόνη δίδωσιν αὐτῇ ἓν ἥμισυ τάλαντον.

Granted that the historical present is good Greek idiom, how probable is it that its presence in Jn is due to Aramaic influence? The only objective evidence is to be found in a study of such "translation Greek" as is found in the LXX and Theodotion. Thackeray's attack on Allen's claim for Aramaisms in the Marcan use shows that Mk uses the historic present in the same ways that the author of I Kingdoms does. The statistics for the LXX are interesting: "out of 337 instances ...232 occur in the four books of Kingdoms, of which 151 are found in I Kingdoms."[73] Thackeray's arguments seem to have convinced MH that neither the author of I Kingdoms nor Mk owes this usage to Aramaic influence.

Allis has carefully studied the Aramaic participle in Daniel.[74] He points out that in most of the instances cited by Burney "the warrant for treating the verb as participle rather than perfect is simply the vowel pointings," and he argues that the most probable pointing is perfect followed by

---

73 The LXX in Jewish Worship, l.c.
74 PTR,p.554f.

participle. (Burney himself[75] suggested this possibility for the passages which contain the phrase "answering and saying".) Allis suggests further that the 99 instances of participial usage lose something of impressiveness when taken "in connection with the fact that in these same verses the perfect occurs about 300 times." He supplements Burney's figures for Jn in the same way, pointing out 130 instances of the aorist indicative of λέγω "where we believe the historic present would be equally suitable." He rebukes Burney for having given only three occurrences of "answer", which is found 75 times in Jn, and is followed by "say" 36 times. Of these occurrences, "answer" is found in the present tense three times, "say" four times. But his most valuable contribution lies in his study of the translation of "answering and saying" by Theodotion. In only four out of thirty cases, does he find the participle rendered by the present, and in each of these the present is preceded by an aorist, a fact to which Burney failed to call attention.

These arguments by Thackeray and Allis, in connection with the evidence for the existence of the idiom in both classical and Hellenistic Greek, render the invoking of Aramaic influence in Jn both unnecessary and inadvisable.[76]

---

75 AOFG, p.88, footnote.

76 So Lagrange, S.Jean, p.cxii., "mais ce n'est point la preuve que Jo. ait été traduit de l'araméen pas plus que Mc. Sur 99 cas cites par M.Burney et ou, d'apres lui, l'araméen devait conduire à un present historique, Theodotion n'a pris ce parti que 6 fois."

(3) Frequency of Imperfect

With great care, Burney lists all the imperfects in Jn.[77] Since Burney's touchstone for Semitisms was difference from Synoptic usage, we are surprised here to note that Jn's use is more infrequent than that of Mk and Lk, although above that of Mt. When we consider further that excessive frequency is supposed to indicate Aramaic influence, as representing the very frequent Aramaic construction of participle plus a substantive verb in description of past events, the indictment of Jn's infrequency seems the more strange. Burney's explanation is that the small amount of narrative in Jn gives little occasion for the use of this construction, which he would have used more frequently than the Synoptists if he had written as much narrative as they did. He finds a further significance in the fact that ἔλεγεν, ἔλεγον occur 46 times in Jn and 50 in Mk, although they occur but 10 times in Mt and 23 in Lk. By a careful study of the LXX and Theodotion's Daniel, he shows that the Aramaic construction mentioned above <u>is</u> translated constantly by a Greek imperfect. But his claim that "the use of the substantive verb with the participle of ׳אמר 'he was saying' is frequent in Aramaic is supported by no evidence and weakened by the admission that it does not occur in Daniel.

The probability that in Greek the imperfect may dis-

---

77 <u>AOFG</u>, pp.91-93. Lagrange's comment on these figures, <u>S.Jean</u>, p.cxii., is:"Il n'y a rien a en conclure."

pute with the aorist for the right to be regarded as the narrative tense par excellence has been shown by C.W.E.Miller.[78] He gives the following figures:

Author	No. of Imp.	No. of Aor.	% Imp.	% Aor.
Herod. Bk. VII	819	588	58	42
Herod. Bk. VIII	587	399	60	40
Thuc. Bk. VII	593	372	61	39
Thuc. Total	4286	3910	52	48
Xen. Anab. I-IV	1437	880	62	38

His list and discussion includes other figures, but only in Polybius and Arrian's Anabasis Bk. I does the aorist predominate.

For non-narrative Greek, the reviewer of Weymouth's "On the Rendering into English of the Greek Aorist and Perfect"[79] quotes one of Weymouth's tables based on "many chapters" of Thucydides and Herodotus. In it the occurrences of the aorist are 13 in Thucydides, 19 in Herodotus; while the imperfect occurs 8 times in the former, and 4 times in the latter.

In Hellenistic Greek the imperfedt occurs at least as frequently as in Jn. A rapid count of the imperfects in Epictetus I 1-11 gives a total of 70. If this section be extended to approximately the length of Jn, the proportionate number of imperfects would be 140. This must be admitted as approximately equivalent to Jn's 167 on Burney's own plea, for there is much less narrative in the Discourses than there is in the

---

78 "The Imperfect and the Aorist in Greek" AJP XVI 141-142.

79 AJP XVI 259.

Fourth Gospel. Where narrative is found, the imperfect is frequent; e.g.,

IV 8.17-20 διὰ τοῦτο καλῶς Εὐφράτης ἔλεγεν ὅτι ἐπὶ πολὺ ἐπειρώμην...ἦν...ἥδειν...ἐποίουν...ἐποίουν... ἥσθιον...εἶχον...ἠγωνιζόμην...ἐκινδύνευον...ἐκινδυνεύετο ...ἔβλαπτον...ἐθαύμαζον...ἐφιλοσόφουν...ἐποίουν.

In P Oxy III 472 (Speech of an Advocate 130 AD) 55 lines in length, 10 imperfects occur; in P Oxy III 526 (Letter 11 AD) 12 lines in length, 4 out of 6 verbs are in the imperfect, etc. A note from the pen of J.H.Moulton[80] gives evidence for wide variation in Greek usage:

> I find that in Milligan's Selections from the Greek Papyri there are 22 impf. to 111 aor.; in Mk 1, 19:39; in Mt 3 and 4, 7:29; in Polybius (7 pages in Wilamovitz Lesebuch) 37:54; and in Appian(6 pages in do.) 90:25. So Appian here uses the imperf. seven times as much as Mk does and Polybius 1 1/2 times.

The existence of the figures cited above on the proportion of imperfect and aorist in Greek usage suggested a possible value in making such a comparison for Jn. A rapid count of the aorists in chapters 4-12, where Burney found 118 imperfects, gave a total of 417. This would seem to indicate that in the very area which Burney regarded as most favorable to the use of the imperfect, it was outnumbered by the aorists in the ratio of 4:1. This would mean that in proportion with aorists Jn uses fewer imperfects than Herod., Thuc., Xen., Polyb., Arrian, etc. The closest parallels to Jn's proportion of imperfects and aorists are found in the figures cited

---

80 MH II iii.p.45.

by Weymouth for non-narrative sections in Herodotus (4 imperfects to 19 aorists), and the occurrences cited by Moulton from Milligan's Selections (22 imperfects to 111 aorists). A count of the aorists in a half-dozen pages of the Discourses and an estimate of the proportionate number in I 1-11 indicates that the proportion would be about 10 aorists to 7 imperfects, a proportionate use of the imperfect much greater than Jn's.

For the Greek, therefore, the frequency of the imperfects in Jn causes no problem. Burney's argument would have been stronger if there had been some Aramaic idiom which would have justified his claiming Jn's use of the imperfect as infrequent.

The frequency of ἔλεγεν and ἔλεγον is not strange to Greek. On the indifference with which they are used in classical Greek, see the statements of Goodwin quoted on p.23. In Epict. I 26 to II 15, a verb of saying occurs but once in the aorist, five times in the imperfect. Instances are not wanting from Epictetus and the papyri in which this imperfect seems to have the force of the aorist; e.g.,

Epict. IV 1.173 καθάπερ καὶ ὁ Κλεάνθης ἔλεγεν,

P Oxy XIV 1672 (Letter 37-41 AD) line 16f. Μουνάτιος δὲ ὁ φίλος συντυχὼν ἔλεγεν συμ[πε]φωνηκέναι τοῖς ἐκ τῆς κώ[μ]ης αὐτοῦ.

3.Negative Adverbs

a.πᾶς μή = "none"

Burney finds this Semitism in Jn 6:30 ἵνα πᾶν ὃ δέδωκέν μοι μὴ ἀπολέσω ἐξ αὐτοῦ, and 12:46 ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ μὴ μείνῃ; also in Mt 24:22 (Mk 13:20); Lk 1:37; Rom 3:20; Gal 2:16; Eph 4:29; 5:5; II Pe 1:20; I Jn 2:21; Apoc 6:16; 17:22; 21:27; 22:3.[81]

WM makes two distinct classes of the uses of this idiom in the NT:

> This Hebraism should in strictness be limited to the expression οὐ (μή)...πᾶς, for in sentences with πᾶς...οὐ (μή), there is usually nothing that is alien to Greek usage or else the writer's reason for choosing this particular mode of expression is evident of itself. I Jn 2:21 πᾶν ψεῦδος ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας οὐκ ἔστιν, all falsehood (every lie) is not of the truth, is a sentence which any Greek might have written.[82]

The passages listed by Burney, classified according to WM's distinction, divide as follows: (a) The strict Semitisms are found in Mt 24:22 (Mk 13:20); Lk 1:37; Ro 3:20; Gal 2:16; Apoc 6:16; 21:27. Each of these is a direct or indirect OT quotation. (b) The two passages in Jn cited by Burney fall outside the class of Semitisms into that "which any Greek might have written. With them go the remaining passages listed above, only one of which (Apoc 22:3) is a quotation from the OT. These facts would lead us to expect that if Jn were a translation from Aramaic, there would be some instances in Jn that could be classified under (a). The type

---

81 AOFG,p.98. 82 pp.214-215.

of construction called a strict Semitism by WM is common in the LXX.

R. Law claims "that in vernacular Greek the negative was attached in sense to the verb, where we attach it to the nominative ('all are not' equals 'none are'). The attachment of οὐ to what seems to us the wrong word is not unusual in Greek (e.g. in Aristoph. Vesp. 1091, πάντα μὴ δεδοικέναι = μηδὲν δεδοικέναι—J.H.M.) and is invariable in the common οὐ φημὶ τοῦτο εἶναι, "I say that this is not so."[83] Radermacher quotes[84] Dion. H. Ep. ad Pomp. 756R οὐκ ἀπὸ τοῦ βελτίστου πάντα περὶ αὐτῶν γράφων. Another example is P Ryl ii. 113,12 (A.D.133) "where Hieracion of Letopolis, beekeeper, complains of unjust treatment from persons μὴ ἔχοντας πᾶν πρᾶγμα πρὸς με."[85]

b. οὐκ ἄνθρωπος = "no one"

Burney points out that because the Heb. אִישׁ, Aram. אֱנָשׁ, can be used to mean "any one", the use of a negative with it makes it equivalent to "no one". He finds "no one" expressed in the same way in

Jn 3:27 Οὐ δύναται ἄνθρωπος λαμβάνειν οὐδὲν ἐὰν...

Jn 5:7 ἄνθρωπον οὐκ ἔχω ἵνα... βάλῃ με εἰς τ. κολυμβήθραν.

Jn 7:46 Οὐδέποτε ἐλάλησεν οὕτως ἄνθρωπος,

as also in Mk 11:2; 12:14. In a footnote, he claims that ἄνθρωπος = τις is found in Jn 3:1,4; 7:23,51.[86]

---

83 Quoted in MH II iii.p.433.
84 Grammatik, p.220.
85 MH II i.p.22, footnote 3.
86 AOFG, p.98.

MH refers[87] to the new LS, where under ἀνήρ the following examples are given: "V.5 a man, any man εἰτ' ἄνδρα τῶν αὐτοῦ τι χρὴ προϊέναι; Ar.Nu.1214; οὐ πρέπει νοῦν ἔχοντι ἀνδρί Pl.Phd.114d,etc.; οὐ παντὸς ἀνδρὸς... 'tis not every one that can go. Nicol-Com.1.26." But under ἄνθρωπος the only example cited of use equivalent to τις is I Cor. 4.1.

Lagrange, however, says that ἄνθρωπος for "quelqu'un, un tel" is found in Greek, and quotes Aristotle, Met. IV.7.[88]

This use of ἄνθρωπος as equivalent to an indefinite pronoun is fairly common in Epictetus; e.g.,

II 13.1 Ὅταν ἀγωνιῶντα ἴδω ἄνθρωπον, λέγω...

where the ἄνθρωπον has the same force as the τινὰ in

II 13.5 ὅταν ἴδω τινὰ φοβούμενον,

as Mrs. Carter shows by her translation: "Whenever I see any one solicitous, I say..." In I 19.17 also there can be no doubt that ἄνθρωπος is used in an indefinite sense; but no examples of ἄνθρωπος with a negative to mean "no one" have been noticed. Nor does this meaning seem to be the exact and full meaning of the three passages quoted by Burney. In the first, John the Baptist is speaking of himself in contrast with the Divine Jesus; in the third, the same contrast between man and Jesus, the Divine Being, may well have been intended by the author of the gospel; in the second, the suitableness of "I have not a man to put me in the pool" is plain.

---

87 II iii.p.433. 88 S.Jean,p.cxiii.

c. οὐ μὴ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα="never"

Burney regards this idiom in Jn 4:14; 8:51,52; 10:28; 11:26; 13:8 as a translation of the Hebrew and Aramaic idiom "not...for ever", giving as one of several examples Dan 2:44 דִּי לָעָלְמִין לָא תִתְחַבַּל "which shall never be destroyed."[89] Elsewhere in the NT the construction is found only in Mt 21:19 (Mk 11:14); Mk 3:29; and I Cor 8:13 οὐ μὴ φάγω κρέα εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

It is hardly possible that Burney regarded οὐ μὴ as an integral part of the Aramaic idiom, since it contains but one negative to the Greek's two. As a matter of fact this double negative with either future indicative or aorist subjunctive was in Hellenistic times a common method of expressing a strong negative assertiom about the future.[90] Cf.

BGU II 531 (Letter 70-80 AD) col. II, line 18 ὅτι οὐ μὴ με λοιπήσῃς.

So several times in P Oxy I 119 (Letter ii/iii AD) lines 4,6, 14,15.

Nor can it be claimed that αἰών is of itself essentially Semitic. Walter Bauer says of it:

> Mit negation, niemals, niemals mehr...Besonders im joh. Sprachgebrauch, wo es z.T. ganz formelhaft verwendet wird u. oft d.Begriff der Ewigkeit vergessen ist...v. der zukünftigen Zeit, die, wenn sie kein Ende hat, gleichfalls d. Begriff d. Ewigkeit(so seit Plato den Griechen halläufig) gewinnt; εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα (seit Isokrat 10,62, auch Dittenb. Syll.

---

89 AOFG,p.99.
90 Olsson, op.cit.,p.133; BD # 365; Proleg.,p.296f.

814,50 u. Or.inscr.Index VIII, P Oxy 41 LXX).[91]

The papyrus use alluded to is

P Oxy 41 (Report of a Public Meeting iii/iv AD) line 11 (cf. lines 2 & 21) Ἄγουστοι κύριοι εἰς τὸν ἐῶνα

The value of this construction in Jn as an evidence for an Aramaic original must be estimated in the light of its use in the LXX, in Paul, and in the following passages from Hermas:

Vis. II 3.3 οὐ διαφθαρήσονται ἕως αἰῶνος

Sim. IX 24.4 οὐκ ἐξαλειφθήσεται τὸ σπέρμα ὑμῶν ἕως αἰῶνος.

4. The Adjective

a. μέσος as a noun

Wellhausen claimed that in Jn μέσος was an adjective and not a noun as in Semitic;[92] in regard to this Torrey says, "The claim that in John μέσος is an adjective, not a noun 'as in Semitic', is refuted by 20:19,26, εἰς τὸ μέσον. ."[93] Torrey's position, then, would seem to be that in spite of Wellhausen, μέσος is used as a substantive in Jn and is consequently an evidence of Semitic origin.

As a matter of fact both these points of view are wrong: μέσος <u>is</u> used as a noun in Jn, but this use is one of the best attested of Greek usages at all stages of the de-

---

91 <u>Wörterbuch</u>, s.v.
92 <u>Das Johannis Evangelium</u> # 19.
93 <u>Review</u>, p.322.

velopment of the language. In classical usage, "Neuter adjectives and participles are freely employed as substantives in almost any relation...," and Gildersleeve supports this statement with examples, including μέσος from Isoc., Plato, Xen., Thuc., and Homer.[94] A glance at the discussion of μέσος in LS is convincing proof of the idiomatic nature of its use as a substantive in classical Greek.[95]

For the commonness of the construction in the Koine, no better witness could be found than Epictetus. Like Jn, he uses μέσος as a noun in the accusative after εἰς ; e.g.,

I 22.5 Κάλει γὰρ αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ μέσον

II 22.14 ἀλλ' ἐμπεσούσης εἰς τὸ μέσον ὥσπερ κρέως τῆς τυραννίδος ὅρα οἷα λέγουσι·

The same phrase occurs in II 22.23,33; III 9.13; IV 1.47; 5.24. He also uses μέσος as a noun in the other cases; e.g., with ἐκ and the genitive in III 3.15, with ἐν and the dative in III 22.55.

In the papyri, the most common use of μέσος is in the accusative after ἀνά ; e.g., P Fay 108 (Petition to the Strategus 171 AD) line 10; P Oxy I 99 (Sale of House Property 55 AD) line 9; BGU I 165 (Fragment ii/iii AD) lines 5,6. The use of the genitive with the article after ἐκ occurs in BGU II 388 (Record of a Lawsuit ii/iii AD) col. II,line 23. And the persistence of the use in the accusative after εἰς is

---

94 Greek Syntax i.,pp.13-17.

95 For further examples from classical Greek, cf. WM, p.153; BD # 264,4; Bauer, Wörterbuch, s.v.; KG # 462,e.

shown by an instance in a mutilated fourth century record of some public celebration, P Oxy 41, line 20. Equally obvious as a substantive, though without a preposition, is the following example:

P Oxy III 466 (Directions for Wrestling ii AD) line 17 παράθες τὸ μέσον.

b. Superlative for Comparative

Montgomery notes the occurrence of this idiom in Jn 1:15 πρῶτός μου and says that he finds parallels for it in Biblical Aramaic and Syriac.[96]

In the Greek, the only notable thing is this use of a superlative for a comparative. And, indeed, the use of a superlative where we would expect a comparative is not infrequent in classical Greek usage. WM claims that "it is quite common to find πρῶτος, δεύτερος, not πρότερος, ὕστερος, even where there is a distinct reference to two and two only;"[97] and cites Aelian Anim II 38 and VIII 12. Gildersleeve quotes a passage where πρώτοις is coordinate with ὕστερον:[98]

Antiphon 5,42 τοῖς μὲν πρώτοις καὶ τοῖς ὕστερον λόγοις.

Bauer[99] refers to Plutarch Cato Minor 18, Sallust De diis et mundo 8 p.257, and

Eratasthenes Catasterium c.42 καὶ πρῶτος ἀνατέλλει

---

96 Origin, p.16. Burney, AOFG pp.103-104, lists it among mistranslations, but he finds no linguistic difficulty in the Greek. Burrows, JBL 45, p.67, thinks Jn 1:15 originated in Gk.

97 p.306.

98 Greek Syntax ii., p.285.

99 Das Johannes Evangelium p.25.

καὶ δύνει ἐκείνου.

Bernard[100] regards πρῶτος as equivalent to πρότερος, and quotes

Xen. Mem. I ii.46 δεινότατος σαυτοῦ ταῦτα ἧσθα.

Moulton has pointed out[101] that in Hellenistic Greek, due to confusion of comparative and superlative, the use of πρότερος was vanishing, only one instance occurring in the first four Oxyrhynchus volumes. He calls attention to the phrase μέγιστον καὶ γνησιώτερον in illiterate papyri, as an instance of this confusion. Sharp has called attention[102] to the same kind of construction in Epictetus:

III 7.4 ἀγαθὰ δὲ τὰ τοῦ κρατίστου κρείττονά ἐστιν ἢ τὰ τοῦ φαυλοτέρου;

In Epictetus are found clear cases also of the use of the superlative when there are only two members of the comparison:

II 12.20 'πότερον ταῦτά σοι τὰ κράτιστά ἐστιν ἢ καὶ ἄλλο τι ἐκτήσω πάντων ἄμεινον;'

Cf. IV 1.106; III 7.24. The opposite interchange occurs in II 6,19.

In the papyri, the superlative sometimes occurs where we would expect a comparative; e.g.,

BGU I 282 (Registration of Land 175 AD) line 10f. ἐν δυσὶ σφραγ[εῖσι]... οὗ γείτονες τῆς μὲν πρώτης σφραγεῖδος.

Cf. P Oxy III 508 (Security for a Debt 102 AD) line 5f.

The closest parallel to Jn 1:15 is that which has been

---

100 St.John i.,p.28. For a discussion of Jn 1:15 and possible parallels in Greek, cf. JG # 1896-1901,2665-2667.

101 Proleg.,pp.78-79

102 Epictetus and the New Testament, pp.61-62.

quoted by MM[103]

P Leid W xii.49 (ii/iii AD) ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Φόβος αὐτοῦ ἰσχυρότερον ἀντέστη αὐτῷ, λέγων· σου πρῶτος εἰμι.

That this passage in Jn was an instance of the use of the superlative for the comparative was the opinion of J.H. Moulton,[104] and the evidence given above confirms this explanation.

c. Omission of Article

Torrey protests against Wellhausen's claim[105] that no trace of the construct state is to be found in Jn, and quotes[106]

1:49 βασιλεὺς . . . τοῦ Ἰσραήλ

5:29 εἰς ἀνάστασιν ζωῆς... εἰς ἀνάστασιν κρίσεως

5:27 υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστί

4:5 πηγὴ τοῦ Ἰακώβ

6:68 ῥήματα ζωῆς αἰωνίου

9:5 φῶς εἰμι τοῦ κόσμου

The omission of the article was common in classical Greek with a predicate noun, after prepositions, or when the noun modified was completed by a substantive in the genitive.[107]

It may be noted of Torrey's six examples, that four occur in the predicate, that the phrases in 5:29 also follow a preposition; and Moulton had long ago pointed out the qualitative force of the expression in 6:68.

---

103 Vocab. s.v. πρῶτος.
104 Expositor X 133, quoted in JG p.510, footnote 2.
105 Das Johannis Evangelium #1,17.
106 Review, pp.323-324.
107 KG # 461,1;462,f,k, gives numerous examples.

Walter Bauer's caution in regard to Greek usage deserves quotation: "Feste Regeln für d. Setzung des Artikels aufzustellen, ist, wie Buttmann S.75 mit Recht bemerkt, kaum möglich, da gerade hier das Stilgefühl d. Schreibenden besonders weiter Spielraum hatte."[108]

The following passages, selected from many, indicate that the omission of the article after a preposition was possible in Hellenistic Greek:

Epict. IV 8.36 ἐκ κήπου Ἀδωνιακοῦ.

Epict. IV 1.51 ἔχεις γὰρ ἀφορμὰς παρὰ τῆς φύσεως πρὸς εὕρεσιν τῆς ἀληθείας.

P Oxy XIV 1647 (Apprenticeship to a Weaver ii AD) line 12f. πρ[ὸς] μάθησιν τῆς γερδι[α]κῆς τέχνης.

P Oxy IV 736 (Private Account i AD) col.II, line 13 μύρου εἰς ἀποστολὴν ταφῆς θυγατρὸς Φνᾶς.

The article is omitted also where it does not follow a preposition and is as definite as those cited in Jn; e.g.,

Epict. I 17.12 καὶ τίς ἐστιν ὁ γεγραφὼς ὅτι ἀρχὴ παιδεύσεως ἡ τῶν ὀνομάτων ἐπίσκεψις;

Epict. I 19.12 ἀλλ' ὅταν θέλῃ εἶναι Γέτιος καὶ Ἐπικάρπιος καὶ πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε...

P Teb II 308 (Receipt 174 AD) line 7f. τιμὴν βίβλου μυριάδων δύο

P Oxy I 34 (Edict of a Prefect 137 AD) col.I, line 17 πρ[ὸς θή]σ[ου]σ[ι] δὲ καὶ τῶν κολλύμ[α]των ἀριθμὸν καὶ

---

108 Wörterbuch, s.v.

τὰ ὀνόματα τῶ[ν] συναλλαξάντων

Note in the last instance the variation between the coordinate τῶν κολλημάτων ἀριθμὸν and τὰ ὀνόματα τῶ[ν] συναλλαξάντων.

The same variation occurs in the Discourses; e.g.,

I 4.6 τί ἔργον ἀρετῆς;

I 4.10 τὸ ἔργον τῆς ἀρετῆς,

and also in the following passage,

P Oxy I 37 (Report of a Lawsuit 49 AD) line 19 ἔχω[ι] πρῶτον γράμμα τῆς τροφείτιδος, ἔχωι δεύτερο[ν] τῶν τροφείων τὴν [ἀ]ποχή[ν].

where there can be no doubt of the definiteness of either γράμμα or ἀποχήν.

In connection with proper names or definitely known persons, titles often assume the form βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ισραήλ; e.g.,

P Oxy I 34 (Edict of a Prefect 137 AD) col.III, line 1 Τῖτος Φλαούιος Τιτιανὸς ἔπαρχος Αἰγύπτου.

Epict. I 1.16 σὲ γὰρ οὐκ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς ταμίαν τῶν ἀνέμων, ἀλλὰ τὸν Αἴολον.

Epict. I 3.1 καὶ ὁ θεὸς πατήρ ἐστι τῶν τ'ἀνθρώπων καὶ τῶν θεῶν.

These parallels to Johannine usage and the frequent omission of the article in classical Greek,[109] together with the wide variation in the usage of various authors, makes Lagrange's conclusion, "On ne voit dans Jo. aucun cas positif de l'etat construit," seem preferable to Torrey's claim.[110]

---

109 cf. JG # 1966 for justification of Jn 1:49 as classical usage.

110 For Lagrange's view, cf. S.Jean, p.cxv.

d."The Son of.."

In Jn 17:12 ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας is regarded by Montgomery[111] as an example of this characteristic Semitic construction. The idiom occurs also in 12:36 υἱοὶ φωτὸς.

Deissmann's argument for the "possibility" of the Greek is as follows:

> Plato uses the word ἔκγονος in exactly the same way: Phaed.,p.275D ἔκγονα τῆς ζωγραφίας, and Rep.,pp.506E and 507A, ἔκγονος τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ. In the impressive style of speech on inscriptions and coins, we find υἱός in a number of formal titles of honor such as υἱὸς τῆς γερουσίας, υἱὸς τῆς πόλεως, υἱὸς τοῦ δήμου, υἱὸς Ἀφροδισιέων, etc. And thus, though the υἱός of the biblical passages...may have been occasioned in the first instance by the original, yet no one can call it un-Greek.[112]

Deissmann distinguishes[113] in the N.T. occurrences of this idiom translations on the one hand, and quotations and analogical formations on the other. The instances in the Synoptics he regards as translations. But he regards Jn 12:36 (cf. I Th.5:5) as a quotation from Lk 16:8; and Jn 17:12 (cf. II Th.2:3) as an echo of the LXX Isa. 57:4 τέκνα ἀπωλείας.[114]

It is a striking fact that each of the two instances of this construction in Jn are paralleled in Paul's letters, and it seems highly probable that the author of the Fourth Gospel may have secured them there. The idiom occurs also in Eph 2:2; 5:6; Col 3:6; and Hermas Vis. III 6.1,[115] as well as

---

111 Origin p.16.
112 Bible Studies i. pp.165-166.
113 op.cit.p.161f.
114 MH, II iii. p.441, is therefore wrong in giving the impression that Deissmann classes Jn with the Synoptists in the use of this idiom. Moreover, it fails to note Jn 12:36.
115 cited by Walter Bauer, Wörterbuch, s.v. υἱός.

in Acts and the Synoptic Gospels. The instances in Paul and Hermas demonstrate the possibility of the phrase in composition Greek.

5.The Noun

a.The plural αἵματα

Montgomery calls attention to this phrase in Jn 1:13 in a paragraph of Semitic constructions.[116]

That this plural as a plural presents no problem is shown by the statements of almost any Greek grammar. Gildersleeve regards it as so characteristically Greek that he uses it in a quotation from Aeschylus as an example of plural expressions which are idiomatic in Greek but diverge from English usage.[117] WM makes the direct statement that the plural in itself is no problem.[118] And KG[119] gives the following examples of the fact that "Die Stoffnamen werdeh oft im Plural gebraucht:"

Aesch. Eum. 253 ὀσμὴ βροτείων αἱμάτων.

Ch. 284 ἐκ τῶν πατρώων αἱμάτων.

Eurip. Alc. 496 (512) φάτνας ἵδοις ἂν αἵμασιν πεφυρμένας.

In a convincing study of the meaning of the passage,[120] Cadbury also discusses the question of Semitic influence. He

---

116 Origin,p.16.
117 Greek Syntax i.k pp.23-24.
118 pp.220-221. Cf. BD # 141,6; Bauer, Wörterbuch, s.v. αἷμα.
119 # 348,2.
120 The Expositor Dec. 1924, pp.434-436.

points out that Burney[121] retranslates the Greek plural by an Aramaic singular, and that McNeile[122] claims that the Aramaic plural always means shed blood. He quotes as the closest parallels in Greek,

Eurip., Io 693 ἄλλων τραφεὶς ἀφ' αἱμάτων

Plato, Laws, p.887D ἔτι ἐν γάλαξι τρεφόμενοι

Burrows retranslates αἵματα by the plural, a procedure which is somewhat remarkable in the light of his own statements:

> As for the first member of the verse, even if we follow the Greek to the extent of using the plural for the word blood, we have only five syllables...In Hebrew דמים is often used in the plural, but I can find no instance in Aramaic. On the other hand, the plural is not at all common in Greek, though it appears occasionally.(!)[123]

Schaeder[124] uses the singular, דמא in his restoration of the original Aramaic of the Prologue, but puts the plural alongside it in parenthesis with a question mark.

The plural αἵματα would seem therefore to be more plausible as Greek than as Aramaic.

b. The plural ὕδατα

This is classed with αἵματα by Montgomery, who notes that it occurs "but once in Mt, and in Rev several times."[125] Although ὕδωρ occurs several times in Jn, the

---

121 AOFG, p.34.

122 N.T. Teaching in the Light of St.Paul's, p.278.

123 "The Johannine Prologue as Aramaic Verse" JBL 45 (1926) p.66, and footnote 22.

124 Reitzenstein-Schaeder, Studien zum antiken Synkretismus aus Iran und Griechenland, p.340.

125 Origin, p.16.

plural occurs but once, Jn 3:23 ὅτι ὕδατα πολλὰ ἦν ἐκεῖ.

Much that has been said of the classical use of αἵματα applies here equally well. KG[126] classifies this plural with αἵματα as Montgomery does, but for a different reason; for the Greek grammaraan it is not a peculiar plural but a common Greek idiom. KG's examples include

X. Comm.1.1,15 ἀνέμους καὶ ὕδατα (Gewässer).

X. Hell. 5.3,19 τῶν λαμπρῶν καὶ ψυχρῶν ὑδάτων.

Its Hellenistic provenance is shown by several instances in the papyri:

P Oxy XII 1409 (Circulars of a Strategus 278 AD) line 18f. ἵν[α ε]ὐμαμῶς [τὴν] ἐσομέν[ην τῶν] ὑδάτων εἴσροιαν ὑποδέχοιντο,

which the Edd. translate "...the coming influx of water."

P Lond III 1177 (Accounts of Water-works Commissioners 113 AD) col.I,lines 7-8 των τεσαρων φρεοντιστων ἀ[γ]αγωγη υδατων καστελλων

Ibid lines 10-12 εις την των υδατων ισαγω[γη]ν

Cf. Ibid col.XIV,line 333; P Oxy XII 1427 (Order to Workmen on Delta Embankments iii AD) line 4, and Hermas Vis.III 2.4; 3:5 twice; 3:7. In the following passages from the Shepherd, the same body of water is spoken of as both plural and singular:

Vis. I 1.3 ἦν δὲ ὁ τόπος κρημνώδης καὶ ἀπερρηγὼς ἀπὸ τῶν ὑδάτων. διαβὰς οὖν τὸν ποταμὸν ἐκεῖνον...

Vis.III 2.9 ἑτέρους δὲ πίπτοντας ἐγγὺς ὑδάτων καὶ μὴ δυναμένους κυλισθῆναι εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ...

Such examples from classical and Hellenistic Greek would seem to justify the single plural in Jn as possible Greek.

c.The plural εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω

This construction is grouped by Montgomery with other "Semitic-looking cases",[127] and he cites Jn 6:66 ἀπῆλθον εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω as an example.

That this phrase does, however, occur in writings composed in Greek is shown by its presence in Phil. 3:13, and the Shepferd of Hermas; e.g.

Vis. IV 3.7 κἀγὼ ἐπεστρέφην εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω

Cf. Sim. IX 2.7.

The idiom occurs elsewhere in the N.T. in Mk 13:16; Lk 9:62; 17:31; Jn 18:6; 20:14. Its occurrence in Lk whose Hebraisms are explained by Burney as imitations of the LXX may be significant; for it occurs frequently in the Greek O.T.

6.The Preposition

a.Frequency of περί

Confusion with ὑπέρ

This characteristic of Jn's Greek is noted by Torrey,[128] who regards it as translation of the Aramaic לע. περί occurs in Jn about 70 times; ὑπέρ about 14 times.

---

127 Origin, p.16.
128 Review, p.322.

Two things are to be noted, therefore, in regard to περί in Greek usage: its frequency, and the possibility of its being confused with ὑπέρ.

This confusion of περί and ὑπέρ is noted for classical Greek by KG, which gives as an example of the frequent interchange of περί and ὑπέρ, Demosthenes 6:35.[129] Jannaris speaks of the frequent interchange of these two prepositions as an acknowledged characteristic of the language.[130]

In Hellenistic Greek the same interchangeability has been pointed out by almost every grammarian and lexicographer who has touched this field.[131] In the papyri an interchange of περί and ὑπέρ is quite common. Ollson lists four occurrences of ὑπέρ = περί in his small collection of Papyrus letters of the Roman period.[132] For περί = ὑπέρ, cf.

P Oxy VI 933 (Letter of Diogenes 11 AD) line 6f. εὐχόμενος πᾶσι το[ῖς θεοῖ]ς πε[ρὶ τ]ῆς [σ]ω[τηρίας σου]

P Teb II 408 (Letter 3 AD) line 5f. παρακαλῶ σε περὶ υἱῶν μου τῆι φιλοστοργίᾳ τῶν περὶ Σωτηρίχου μὴ ἐᾶσαι πυρὸν αὐτοῖς δοθῆναι.

Epictetus plainly shows the equivalence of the two prepositions by using them "in parallel clauses in the same sense:"[133]

---

129 # 460.

130 Historical Grammar #1686.

131 BD # 229,1;230ff. Walter Bauer, Wörterbuch, s.v. περί and ὑπέρ for bibliographical material. MM, Vocab., s.v. περί. Jannaris, Historical Grammar # 1685.

132 Papyrus Briefe, p.237.

133 Sharp, Epictetus and the N.T., p.93, where the first example is quoted.

IV 1.82-83 περὶ τίνος γὰρ φοβήσῃ;... ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τοῦ σώματος καὶ τῆς κτίσεως;

II 13.11 ποῦ ἔτι τόπος ἀγωνίας; ἀλλὰ περὶ τοῦ σωματίου ἀγωνιῶμεν, ὑπὲρ τοῦ κτησιδίου, περὶ τοῦ τί δόξει τῷ Καίσαρι,

II 13.18 τί οὖν σοι μέλει περὶ τῶν ἀλλοτριῶν;... Τί οὖν ἀγωνιᾷς ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀλλοτρίων;

For passages in which ὑπέρ is used where περί might be expected, cf. II 5.20; 13.9. These illustrations of the usage of Epictetus are a most convincing argument for the degree to which περί and ὑπέρ were interchanged in Hellenistic Greek.

The "frequent use of περί" in Jn is not quite as frequent as the use of this preposition in Epictetus and the papyri. But when the frequent use in the Discourses in formal and informal headings, and the common use with the accusative in the papyri to designate place, are taken into account, the frequency is approximately the same. περί is found 78 times in a section of the Discourses equivalent in length to Jn.[134] And in a proportionate section of the papyri, approximately the same number of occurrences is found.

---

134 Mücke, Zu Arrian's und Epiktet's Sprachgebrauche, p.7f. gives a total of 388 occurrences of περί in Epictetus, and 82 for ὑπέρ.

b. ἐκ with Genitive, as a Nominative

This occurs in Jn 16:17 Εἶπαν οὖν ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ πρὸς ἀλλήλους, which is cited by Montgomery[135] as representing "the Semitic partitive use of the preposition min='of'." He quotes also 6:39 ἵνα πᾶν ὃ δέδωκέν μοι μὴ ἀπολέσω ἐξ αὐτοῦ, in which the ἐξ αὐτοῦ is regarded as "emphatically Semitic."

That phrases with ἐκ and ἀπό had largely replaced the use of the simple genitive in Hellenistic times was stated by Moulton in his Prolegomena.[136] The use of a partitive genitive as subject or object of a verb is to be found in classical Greek, although as BD says, "ganz vereinzelt". It cites[137] Xenoph. An. III 5.16, and

Hell. IV 2.20 Πελληνεῖς δὲ κατὰ Θεσπιὰς γενόμενοι ἐμάχοντό τε καὶ ἐν χώρᾳ ἔπιπτον ἑκατέρων.

This usage is common in the LXX. Lagrange, who regards this as a very Semitic substitute for the pronoun, notes that in Daniel 2:41 the Aramaic מִנְהֹן is rendered by μέρος μέν τι... μέρος δέ τι.

7. The Conjunction

a. Καί Adversative

This use of καί is claimed by Burney[138] as Semitic, and he finds approximately 30 instances of its use in Jn.

---

135 Origin, p.17.
136 p.102.
137 Quoted in MH II iii., p.433.
138 AOFG, p.66.

But Lagrange limits the adversative sense to 1:5 and 17:11, and admits that in Greek one finds "aussi le sens pleinement adversatif."[139]

KG finds four uses of καί in classical Greek, three of these are those attacked by Burney as being Semitic. As examples of καί adversative, it quotes[140]

Th 1.74 ἐδείσατε ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ οὐκ ἡμῶν τὸ πλέον.

S. OC. 1129 ἔχω γὰρ ἄχω διὰ σὲ κοὐκ ἄλλον βροτῶν.

and also Eur.H.f.509; S. OC.1369; Hdt 3.115; Th IV 99.1; Pl. Prot.337b,116,332.[141]

This use of καί is found in both Epictetus and the papyri; e.g.,

P Teb II 278 (Acrostics i AD) line 30 ζητῶι καὶ οὐχ εὑρίσκωι. "I seek but do not find it."-Edd.

BGU II 384 (Letter ii/iii AD) line 7f. Ἤθελον καὶ πέμψε σοί τι ἄλλο, καὶ οὐδεὶς λαμβάνε[ι], ὅ[πω]ς σοι κομισθῇ.

EPict. II 14.21 εἰ μὴ καὶ ὁ ἰατρὸς τὸν νοσοῦντα ὑβρίζει, ὅταν εἴπῃ αὐτῷ 'ἄνθρωπε, δοκεῖς μηδὲν ἔχειν, πυρέσσεις δὲ· διψήσατε σήμερον, ὕδωρ πίε.' καὶ οὐδεὶς λέγει 'ὢ δεινῆς ὕβρεως.'

Epict. I 11.32 καὶ νῦν ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἀνέρχῃ, ὅτι δοκεῖ σοι· κἂν μεταδόξῃ, οὐκ ἂν ἀπελεύσῃ.

Cf. Epict. I 27.1;22.1;7.24;5.4-5; P Oxy I 33 (Interview with an Emperor ii AD) col.II,line 13; BGU I 38 (Letter) line 15.

---

139 S.Jean,p.cvi.
140 # 521,4.
141 Additional examples from classical Greek are cited by Bernard, St. John I 13-14, Bauer, Wörterbuch,s.v.

Pernot, in commenting on the adversative force of in Jn 1:10, says, "On dirait de meme en grec moderne. La traduction de l'Evangile en grec vulgaire due a Pallis, renferme la plupart de ces renseignments."[142] The idiom would seem therefore to have been at home in the language throughout its history.

b. Καί Introducing a contrasting incredulous Question

This is the second of the uses of Καί noted by Burney in Jn,[143] as showing Semitic influence. Of this Lagrange says, "Le grec admettait tres bien la phrase interrogative commencant par Καί, cf. Eur. Medee, 1398 Κἄπειτ' ἔκανες; Dans ce cas le Καί est souvent ironique, mais il a en somme le sens de 'et cependant' qui est souvent le sien."[144]

KG speaks of καί as introducing a question "indem der Fragende mit Verwundering die Rede eines anderen aufnimmt und aus derselben einen Schluss zieht, der die aufgestellte Behauptung in ihrer nichtigkeit hinstellt;"[145] and quotes Eur. H.f.292 καὶ τίς θανόντων ἦλθεν ἐξ Ἅιδου πάλιν; and Xen.Cyr.4.3,11;Conv.4,62;Antiph.5,57;Isae.1,20.10,13;Isoc 12,23.15,218.[146]

This use of καί occurs in the papyri and Epictetus; e.g., P Oxy I 33 (Interview with an Emperor ii AD) col.I, line 6 ἰδὼν Ἡλιόδωρον εἶπεν· Ἡλιόδωρε, ἀπαγομένου μου

---

142 Revue, p.127 143 AOFG, p.67 144 S.Jean, p.cvi.
145 # 521,3. 146 cf. MH II iii.422-423. Wörterbuch s.v.

οὐδὲν λαλεῖς; Ἡλιόδωρος εἶπεν· καὶ τίνι ἔχομεν λαλῆσαι μὴ ἔχοντες τὸν ἀκούοντα;

Epict. II 21.11 ἄνθρωπ', ἐν οἴκῳ διαπεπύκτευκας τῷ δουλαρίῳ, τὴν οἰκίαν ἀνάστατον πεποίηκας, τοὺς γείτονας συντετάραχας· καὶ ἔρχῃ μοι καταστολὰς ποιήσας ὡς σοφὸς καὶ καθήμενος κρίνεις, πῶς ἐξηγησάμην τὴν λέξιν...;

Epict. I 29.11 ναί· ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν δογμάτων ἄρχειν θέλω.' καὶ τίς σοι ταύτην τὴν ἐξουσίαν δέδωκεν;

cf. I 2.18;9.8;19.2;25.9.

This evidence seems to be sufficient to justify Pernot's verdict: "Du plus pur grec."[147]

c. Καί="and so"

This use, which is "very frequent in Semitic", is found in a few passages in Jn by Burney: 6:57; 11:48; and 5:10 Σάββατόν ἐστιν, καὶ οὐκ ἔξεστίν σοι ἆραι τὸν κράββατον.

The infrequency of the construction in Jn is due, he alleges, to the frequency of οὖν in Jn, itself due to the same Semitic idiom.[148]

This use of καί is, however, as good Greek as the preceding ones which Burney mentioned. KG describes as a Greek idiom what has just been described as a Semitic idiom, and gives several examples from Greek literature; e.g.,[149]

S. El.1207 πιθοῦ λέγοντι κοὐχ' ἁμαρτήσῃ ποτέ.

---

147 Revue, p.128. 148 AOFG, p.68. 149 II, p.248l

This construction is recognized as good Greek by Lagrange[150] who quotes Plato, Phaed. 59e, and cites Eucl. IV 6.

Nor has this usage any lack of attestation in Hellenistic Greek. It occurs with fair frequency in Epictetus and the papyri; e.g.,

P Teb II 283 (Petition 93 or 60 BC) line 12f. δέδωκα αὐτῇ πληγὰς πλείους εἰς τὸ {ἐξ}τυχὸν μέρος τοῦ σώματος καὶ κινδύνῳ τῷ ζῆν.

Epict. I 24.19 ἀλλὰ μακάριος ὁ δεῖνα μετὰ πολλῶν γάρ περιπατεῖ. κἀγὼ συγκατατάττω ἐμαυτὸν σὺν τοῖς πολλοῖς καὶ μετὰ πολλῶν περιπατῶ.

Epict. I 9.27 πρότερον μὲν ἐπιφανὴς ὢν καὶ πλούσιος, ὕστερον δ'ἐκπεπτωκὼς ἁπάντων καὶ διάγων ἐνταῦθα. κἀγὼ ἔγελφα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ ταπεινῶς.

Cf. Epict. I 4.2;2.18,25; P Oxy I 106 (Revocation of a Will 135 AD) line 4f.; P Oxy III 474 (Circular to Officials 184 AD) line 33f.; P Oxy II 286 (Claim of a Creditor 82 AD) line 13; P Oxy III 472 (Speech of an Advocate 130 AD) col.III,line 46f.

d.Frequency of οὖν

The extraordinary frequency (as compared with the Synoptics) of this conjunction in Jn is regarded by Burney[151] as a reflection of the frequent use of "and" with the sense "and so" in Semitic. He explains in a footnote that he arrived at this conclusion before reading Burkitt's argument that εὖ θως

---

150 S.Jean,p.cvii. 151 AOFG,p.68.

in Mk and οὖν in Jn represent the Hebrew waw-consecutive.[152] Since Burney's argument is that Jn was written in Aramaic which had no waw-consecutive construction and was characterized by asyndeton, it is hard to see just why the argument from Hebrew was drawn in here.

Jn's use of οὖν 200 times does seem extraordinary when compared with Mt's 57, Mk's 6, and Lk's 31. It is not quite so startling in comparison with Epictetus' use of it 173 times in I 1-24, a section which approximates the size of Jn. The average use in 375 papyri tabulated approximates the use in Mt and Lk. The variation here also is high. Only 57 out of the 375 papyri used οὖν at all, and one of the 57 used it 11 times in 162 lines.

Bernard notes the manner of its use in Jn as "seldom expressing logical sequence but generally historical transition only (as in Homer)."[153]

The Semitic influence supposed by Burney seems a conjecture of the most useless sort. Οὖν he says, represents the Semitic waw meaning "and so". But he argues elsewhere that this is translated in Jn by καί, and, as has been shown above, καί="and so" is common in Greek. Why then would the translator use οὖν? Its frequency in the Stoic-Cynic Diatribe joins with the logic of Burney's own argument to render the supposition unnecessary.[154]

---

152 Evangelion da-Mepharreshe ii.,p.89.
153 St.John i.,p.37. cf. JG # 2460, LS s.v. οὖν.
154 cf. Lagrange,S.Jean,p.cvii.

c. Infrequency of δέ

Jn and Mk use δέ only half as often as Mt and Lk, and the explanation given by Burney[155] is that W.Aramaic, like Hebrew, has no equivalent for δέ.

Jannaris[156] regards it as probable that the limited use of δέ in the N.T. is the first indication of its retreat from popular speech, a retreat that became complete in the period 600-1000 A.D. Its non-existence in modern colloquial Greek supports the theory that its use was already declining in the N.T. period, in the judgement of Pernot,[157] who regards this as another instance of the more colloquial nature of the Greek of Mk and Jn.

Some support for this claim may be seen in the relative frequency of δέ in Epictetus and the papyri. Epictetus uses the conjunction more frequently than Jn does, about 250 in a section the length of Jn (as compared with Jn's 176), but his usage is closer to Mk and Jn than to Mt and Lk. On the other hand, δέ occurs in the papyri less frequently than in Jn, as far as an approximate estimate shows. In the 375 papyri tabulated, it occurs a little over 300 times, which on the estimated size of the papyri would reduce to an average about as much below Jn's as Epictetus' is above it.

There is, however, nothing like uniformity in the usage of the papyri. For instance, P Oxy III 496 (Marriage Contract 127 AD) is only 16 lines in length and contains δέ

---

155 AOFG,p.69. 156 Hist.Gram.,p.402. 157 Revue 128.

13 times; while the very similar P Oxy II 267 (Agreement of marriage 36 AD) contains δέ only 4 times in 39 lines. Or to look at it another way, the 25 papyri that contain δέ only once range in size from 6 lines to 55 lines. These are mere suggestions that variation in the frequency of the use of δέ may depend upon other things than the presence or absence of Semitic influence.

f. Frequency of γάρ

γάρ is less frequent in Jn than in the Synoptics, as Burney[158] says, but a less significant difference could hardly find a place in a linguistic argument. Using Burney's figures and making all the gospels the length of Mt, the occurrences would be Mt 125, Mk 96, Lk 95, Jn 86. It would evidently take a variation of less than 5 in a hundred to convince Burney that there was even approximate agreement in usage. His argument rests upon a childlike faith in the tremendous significance of any variation between Jn and any one of the Synoptics. As the figures stand, it would seem to the casual observer that it was Mt's over-use of γάρ that called for explanation; or, assuming that a difference of 9 between Lk and Jn demands explanation, does not a difference of 30 between Lk and Mt demand explanation? The explanation of the infrequency in Jn seems rather too formidable for the amount of difference: "In many cases in which Greek would use γάρ, Ara-

---

158 AOFG, p.69.

maic would be content with 'and' simply; and this may account for the comparative infrequency of γάρ in Jn."[159] If such a common construction had any influence, would it exert its influence in only ten cases out of a hundred?

In a section of the Discourses approximately the same length as Jn, there are 99 occurrences of γάρ. Since the count has not been checked and the size of the section has been estimated by the average number of words to the page, this may be called approximate agreement with Mk, Lk, and Jn. In the Papyri, γάρ seems to be used less frequently than in Epictetus and the gospels. In 375 papyri, 76 occurrences of γάρ were counted. That would mean that γάρ occurred only about one third as often in the papyri as in Jn. Yet even here there is a fair amount of variation. Although it is true that most papyri do not contain a single instance of γάρ yet in P Oxy III 472 (Speech of an Advocate 130 AD) 55 lines in length, it occurs 9 times, and in P Teb II 315 (Letter ii AD) 35 lines in length, 8 times. It is obvious that the variations between the gospels are not convincing evidence of Aramaic influence upon Jn.

g. Frequency of ἵνα

Using Burney's figures, the occurrences of ἵνα in each gospel are as follows (each being as long as Mt): Mt 33, Mk 88, Lk 25, Jn 163. Burney admits that the use of ἵνα with a finite verb where classical Greek would use an infin-

---

159 AOFG, l.c.

itive is one of the well-ascertained characteristics of Koine Greek. But he claims that the greater frequency in Jn and Mk, tnd the fact that Mt and Lk on 8 occasions avoid the ἵνα -construction of Mk points to the influence of the Aramaic particle ד which was used as a relative pronoun and adverb, a sign of the genitive, and a conjunction. All but the second of these uses, Burney claims, are represented by the use of ἵνα in Jn.[160]

The history of the use of ἵνα is a record of rapid expansion in use after 300 BC, at the expense of ὅπως and ὡς.[161] There was from 150 B.C. to 300 A.D. some reaction against ἵνα on the part of the literati. Jannaris speaks of it as having become "very common-perhaps the commonest word next to καί and the article."[161] That its common use or avoidance could occur on other grounds than Semitic influence is shown by the fact that although it is "Herodotos' favorite particle" and is "fairly frequent in Lucian", yet it is "entirely wanting both in Lucian's typical narrative, True Histories, and in the d.d.S."[162]

Pernot sees the higher frequency in Jn as another sign of the more vulgar quality of Jn's Greek.[163]

In Epictetus' Discourses, ἵνα is used more rarely than in any of the gospels. In a section approximately

---

160 ACFG, p.69. The use of ἵνα as a mistranslation is taken up in the next chapter.
161 Jannaris, Hist. Grammar, pp.416-417.
162 Danial A. Penick, Gildersleeve Studies, pp.390-391.
163 Revue, p.128.

the length of Jn, it occurs 25 times. The same thing is true of the papyri, which average approximately 27 occurrences in the same space.

h. Frequency of ἵνα μή and Absence of μήποτε

The occurrences of ἵνα μή as given by Burney[164] are as follows: Mt 8, Mk 5, Lk 8, Jn 18. But Burney sees significance not only in the number of occurrences in Jn, but also in the fact that ἵνα μή is used in Jn to mean "lest",[165] and μήποτε which he seems to regard as the normal way of expressing "lest" in Greek, never occurs in Jn or the Apocalypse.

Jn's use of ἵνα μή is, however, in line with classical usage:

> The history of the Greek language shows a gradual decrease of final μή and an increase of the final particles with μή in negative final clauses. The tendency in this direction was so strong that ὅπως μή sometimes took the place of μή even after verbs of <u>fearing</u>, to express the object of the fear, while it became the regular form after verbs of <u>striving</u>, etc., to express the onject aimed at.[166]

This statement of Goodwin's, which covers classical usage only, would be equally valid for the <u>Koine</u> if ἵνα were substituted for ὅπως in his sentence as it actually was in Koine usage.

ἵνα μή is not as frequent in Epictetus or the papyri as it is in Jn. In Epictetus it occurs with about half the

---

164 <u>AOFG</u>, p.69.
165 <u>AOFG</u>, p.100.
166 <u>Moods and Tenses</u>, p.112.

frequency of Jn, and in the papyri still more infrequently. Here again, therefore, the evidence of the Discourses and the papyri furnish no justification for the frequency of the idiom in Jn. But lest this should be taken as ample justification for the assumption that Jn was translated from an Aramaic gospel, it should be noted that "ἵνα μή is found twice as often in the Pauline Epistles as in Jn."[167]

Burney stresses his second point in regard to ἵνα μή: that ἵνα μή means "lest" in ten passages in Jn: 3:20;5:14;7:23;12:35,40,42;16:1;18:28,36;19:31. The difference in use between "lest" and "that not" is not much sharper in Greek than in English, the clearest examples of "lest" occurring after verbs of fearing. Burney can find no such use of ἵνα μή in Jn, although it was already current in classical Greek.

"Ἵνα μή meaning "lest" is as much at home in Hellenistic Greek as in Jn. Take, e.g., the first of Burney's exx.:

Jn 3:20 οὐκ ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸ φῶς, ἵνα μὴ ἐλεγχθῇ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ.

and compare

Epict. III 24.81 οὐκ ἀρνύσῃ καὶ ὅσα ἔμαθες εἰδέναι, ἵνα μὴ διαβάλῃς τὰ θεωρήματα ὡς ἄχρηστα;

which Mrs. Carter translates, "for fear of bringing a scandal upon theorems so useless;" and

P Oxy X 1294 (Letter ii/iii AD) line 12f. μελη]σάτω δὲ σοι τῶν ἐν τῷ χειλώματι ἵνα μὴ σαπῇ.

---

167 Allis, PTR, p.562.

which is translated by the Editors, "lest they rot".

The absence of μήποτε from Jn is regarded by Burney as significant when compared with its occurrence in Mt 8 times, Mk 5, Lk 8, and its absence from Revelation.

Nothing could more clearly characterize Jn as popular Hellenistic Greek than his failure to use μήποτε. It is absent from the Pauline Epistles.[168] Not a single occurrence was found in the non-literary papyri of the Roman period in the 24 volumes covered in this study. It occurs but once in the Discourses of Epictetus, in IV 13.4, the last chapter of the last book.

Burney concludes his treatment of ἵνα μή-μήποτε with the claim that the use of ἵνα μή in Jn 12:40 proves that Jn is translated from Ara.aic:

> A striking proof that Jn's ἵνα μή = "lest" represents the Aramaic לא is to be seen in the quotation from Isaiah 6:10 which occurs in Jn 12:40. In this quotation the Heb. uses פן "lest", and this is represented in LXX by μήποτε but in Pesh. by ל? "that not"...The quotation is given in Mt 13:15 in the ississima verba of LXX; while Mk 4:12, quoting more freely, yet has the μήποτε of LXX...Jn, however, rendering ἵνα μὴ ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς, departs from the Heb. and LXX phrases in order to use an Aramaic phrase which is actually employed in the rendering of Pesh. What evidence could prove more cogently that his Greek translates an Aramaic original?[169]

The cogency of this proof is weakened by a more extensive study of the use of ἵνα μή in translation Greek and i in composition Greek. Allis has pointed out that ἵνα μή

---

168 Allis, PTR, p.562.
169 AOFG, p.100.

translates the Hebrew לְמַעַן 11 times in the LXX in the Pentateuch,[170] and MH calls attention to Dr. Charles' argument that Hebrew, not Aramaic, is the background of Revelation where μήποτε never occurs and ἵνα μή occurs 11 times. When one remembers also the overwhelming evidence cited above for the relative frequency of ἵνα μή and infrequency of μήποτε in Hellenistic Greek, the cogency of this proof that Jn's Greek translates an Aramaic original becomes almost a minus quantity.

CHAPTER III

MISTRANSLATIONS

A list of "mistranslations" of the original Aramaic in Jn is discussed by each of the Semitic scholars whose arguments have been followed in this study. Burney's list, which is taken up first here, was regarded as essential to his argument by Burney himself. He prefaces his chapter on Mistranslations with the following sentence: "The most weighty form of evidence in proof that a document is a translation from another language is the existence of difficulties or peculiarities of language which can be shown to find their solution in the theory of mistranslation from the assumed original language."[1] It is to be noted that it is linguistic difficulties and peculiarities which lead him to the claim of mistranslation.

1. ἵνα = ד "who"

"The actual mistranslation of an original Aramaic document"[2] seemed to Burney the only possible explanation of the use of ἵνα in half a dozen Johannine passages:

1:8 οὐκ ἦν ἐκεῖνος τὸ φῶς, ἀλλ' ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ τοῦ φωτός.

5:7 ἄνθρωπον οὐκ ἔχω ἵνα...βάλῃ με εἰς τ. κολυμβήθραν.

6:30 Τί οὖν ποιεῖς σὺ σημεῖον, ἵνα ἴδωμεν...

---

1 AOFG, p.101 2 AOFG, p.75f.

6:50 οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβαίνων ἵνα τις ἐξ αὐτοῦ φάγῃ καὶ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ.

9:36 καὶ τίς ἐστιν, Κύριε, ἵνα πιστεύσω εἰς αὐτόν;

14:16 ἄλλον παράκλητον δώσει ὑμῖν ἵνα ᾖ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

For most of these passages Burney presents no further evidence than a translation into Syriac or Aramaic in which the conjunctive particle could carry the relative meaning. But for 1:8 he notes that it makes the ellipse unnecessary; for 9:36 that the translation of ἵνα as "who" raises the quality of the man's faith. And the clinching evidence for his argument he finds in the fact that Mk 4:22 ἐὰν μὴ ἵνα φανερωθῇ is reproduced in Mt 10:26 by ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται and in Lk 8:17 by ὃ οὐ φανερὸν γενήσεται. In regard to 6:30 he admits that the final sense is as natural in Aramaic as in Greek; so the evidence of this passage is not pressed. He might well have said the same for 6:50; 14:16; 1:8; and--if he had treated the passage linguistically--9:36.

No other part of Burney's thesis has been subjected to more stringent criticism. Torrey's opinion is typical:

> It does not seem to me, however, that defenders of the theory of an originally Greek gospel are likely to be convinced by any of these examples (of mistranslation in the use of ἵνα and ὅτι). The Greek conjunctions in question, especially ἵνα, are used so loosely in the later language that every variety of use in Jn--including such cases as 16:2;32--could be defended by any one who felt defense to be necessary.[3]

This "loose use" of ἵνα is noticeable in Hellenistic

---

3 Review, p.328.

Greek, and instances of ἵνα as the practical equivalent of ὅς are not unknown; e.g.,

Epict. I 24.3 οὐδεὶς δὲ δειλὸν κατάσκοπον πέμπει, ἵν', ἂν μόνον ἀκούσῃ ψόφου καὶ σκιάν ποθεν ἴδῃ, τρέχων ἔλθῃ τεταραγμένος καὶ λέγων ὅδη παρεῖναι τοὺς πολεμίους.[4]

Epict. IV 1.108 τῶν συνεορταζόντων δεῖται, τῶν συγχορευόντων, ἵν' ἐπικροτῶσι μᾶλλον, ἐπιθ[ε]ιάζωσι.[5]

Epict. IV 3.9 ἐλεύθερος γάρ εἰμι καὶ φίλος τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵν' ἐκὼν πείθωμαι αὐτῷ.

Epict. Ench. 51 ποῖον οὖν ἔτι διδάσκαλον προσδοκᾷς ἵνα εἰς ἐκεῖνον ὑπερθῇ τὴν ἐπανόρθωσιν ποιῆσαι τὴν σεαυτοῦ;[6]

Not all of these cases are clear-cut examples of the use of ἵνα as a relative; some are like the passages cited in Jn. But the first and last, at least, are far more convincing than any passage in the Fourth Gospel.

The argument from the Syriac versions and the reconstruction of the Aramaic text has been challenged vigorously. Burney's claim that if the passages in Jn were translated "into Aramaic in the only possible way, representing ἵνα by ܕ,...an Aramaic scholar would, without question, give to that ܕ the sense 'who' or 'which'" will not stand in the face of the following facts:

---

4 Mrs.Carter translates: "a timorous spy,who,when he only hears a noise..." cf. Long's translation,l.c.

5 Mrs.Carter translates: "who may rather extol."

6 cited by MH II iii. p.435 with Melcher's comment: "Att. εἰς ὅντινα ὑπερθήσῃ.

In some of these passages (6:30,50 etc.), "Burkitt renders the de of cur. Sin. by 'that'."[7]

The Latin translation of the Peshitto by Qwilliam has ut where these passages have ἵνα except for 5:7.[8]

G.R.Driver regards Burney's claim as unnecessary in every case.[9]

Lagrange sees nothing to hinder the translation of 5:7 "pour me jeter".[10]

The elimination of the ellipse in 1:8 is not at all necessary for the sake of the Greek.[11] It is common with ἀλλ' ἵνα in Jn.[12] BD finds nothing remarkable in such a construction.[13] It is found in Epictetus; e.g.,

I 17.18 οὐδὲ γὰρ Χρυσίππου χρείαν ἔχομεν δι' αὐτόν, ἀλλ' ἵνα παρακολουθήσωμεν τῇ φύσει.

The facts in regard to this use in Jn may be summarized as follows:

1. In no case is the relative force of ἵνα inescapable;[14] in most cases a final force is suitable.

2. The uses of ἵνα cited by Burney are good Greek, parallel uses can be found in Hellenistic Greek.

3. Authorities on the Semitic languages do not trans-

---

7 Noted by Allis, PTR, p.539.
8 Noted by Lagrange, S. Jean, p.cix.
9 Orig. Lang. 3, quoted in MH II iii.,p.435.
10 S.Jean,p.cix.
11 Pernot, Revue,p.127; Allis, PTR,p.537.
12 cf. JG # 2106f.
13 # 369.
14 Bernard, St.John i.,p.10, regards each of Burney's corrections as "unnecessary".

late these same clauses in Syriac as relative clauses; and several refuse to endorse Burney's claims.

It is hard to see why, considering this evidence--much of which is quoted by it--MH concludes,"We may, therefore, speak of this use in Jn as a secondary Semitism."[15] It is fairly obvious that no definite use in Jn has been established, and that each of the miscellaneous uses of ἵνα assembled by Burney was current in contemperary Greek. We may, therefore, conclude that to speak of a Semitism at all in connection with these passages is justified only by the a priori assumption that the author of the Fourth Gospel shows Semitic influence in everything he writes.

2. ἵνα = ן "when"

In Jn 12:23; 13:1; 16:2,32, Burney regards ἵνα as a mistranslation of ן "when", more strictly speaking relatival "which", with ellipse of "in it".[16] He seems to feel that the alternatives are "when" and "the mystic final sense postulated by Westcott"! It should be noted that in each case ἵνα follows ὥρα.

Torrey's scepticism in regard to this has been quoted above.[17] It is based on a knowledge of the "loose use" of ἵνα in Hellenistic Greek which gave it many another than a mystic final sense.[18] One of these various uses was

---

15 II iii.,p.435.
16 AOFG,p.78.
17. p.110.
18. Moulton, Prolegomena,pp.206-210.

as the equivalent of an infinitive clause, and Allis recognizes that use here.[19]

No exact parallel in Epictetus to this construction after ὥρα has been found, but the following passage is somewhat similar:

III 25.4 οὐδὲ δεῖ περιμεῖναι τετραετίαν ἄλλην, ἵν' ἔλθῃ ἄλλα Ὀλύμπια

And the use of ἵνα with the subjunctive as a substitute for the infinitive is, of course, quite common. MH's summary is a fair statement of the case and will perhaps suffice here since so much space has been given to the similar uses of ἵνα in other sections of this paper.

Mr. G.R.Driver cites several instances from late Gre Greek of καιρὸς ἔρχεται (ἐστιν) ἵνα whilst Mgr. εἶνε καιρὸς νὰ ἔλθῃς is the regular idiom for "it is time for you to come". To this we may add, ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα νὰ πεθάνῃ "the hour came to die" (Thumb Hdb. 187). This usage is therefore at most a secondary Semitism, and can quite as easily be explained by the writer's strong partiality for this particle, which had already gained great flexibility in the Κοινή.[20]

3. Ὅτι = "when"

This mistranslation is found by Burney in two passages in Jn:

9:8 οἱ θεωροῦντες αὐτὸν τὸ πρότερον ὅτι προσάβατης ἦν.

12:41 ταῦτα εἶπεν Ἡσαΐας ὅτι εἶδεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ.

"where the sense demanded" for ὅτι is "when", "and the natural inference is that ? = 'when' has been wrongly interpreted

---

19 PTR, p.545, cf. Jannaris, Hist.Gram., pp.415-416, BD # 369,382.

20 MH II iii., p.470.

as conjunctive'that'."[21]

In neither of these passages does Burney's explanation seem necessary.[22] Allis has suggested that in 9:8 "the ὅτι is simply the equivalent of an accusative with the infinitive, 'who had formerly seen him to be a beggar'."[23] In the second case cited by Burney,

this explanation is unnecessary, whilst in the former Mr. G. R. Driver (ut supra) cft. 4:35, also Ps.-Nicod I B 1.3 εἶδον τοὺς Ἑβραίους ὅτι ἐστρώννυον ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν where the ὅτι clause, according to the late Greek use, plainly means "strewing their garments in the way".[24]

This "late Greek usage" persisted into Modern Greek, and M. Pernot has claimed that the Modern Greek which replaced ὅτι by πῶς or πού, would employ in these instances one or the other of these forms.[25]

That a use of ὅτι which could be translated "when" was not unknown to Hellenistic Greek, is shown by the following passages from Epictetus, in each of which Mrs. Carter translated the ὅτι by "when":

II 14.21 καίτοι τί σοι ἐγὼ κακὸν πεποίηκα; εἰ μὴ καὶ τὸ ἔσοπτρον τῷ αἰσχρῷ, ὅτι δείκνυέι αὐτὸν αὐτῷ οἷός ἐστιν.

II 18.31 ἂν δ' ἅπαξ ἡττηθεὶς εἴπῃς ὅτι ὕστερον νικήσεις, εἶτα πάλιν τὸ αὐτό, ἴσθι ὅτι οὕτως ποθ' ἕξεις κακῶς καὶ ἀσθενῶς, ὥστε μηδ' ἐφιστάνειν ὕστερον ὅτι ἁμαρτάνεις.

---

21 AOFG, p.78.
22 Lagrange, S.Jean, l.c., notices no difficulty.
23 PTR, p.545, cf. BD # 408, and Epict. II 18.32.
24 MH II iii., p.469.
25 Revue, p.128.

This is not to say that either in Jn or in Epictetus the ὅτι must be translated "when", but only to show that an unprejudiced translator of Hellenistic Greek could regard ὅτι as equivalent to "when". As a matter of fact, the translation suggested by Burney for these passages has obviously no advantage over a translation that does not regard ὅτι as representing "when", nor is there any difficulty in the Greek.[26] This "mistranslation" falls with many others, into that class where the argument for the mistranslation rests solely upon the fact that if the passage were translated into Aramaic, two meanings would be possible.

4. ὅτι = ד "who"

Here we find one of the few agreements among those who argue for the Aramaic origin of Jn. Burney and Montgomery both[27] regard the ὅτι in Jn 8:45, ἐγὼ δὲ ὅτι τὴν ἀλήθειαν λέγω, as a mistranslation of the Aramaic ד. Burney makes the same claim for the following passages in Jn:

9:17 Τί σὺ λέγεις περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἠνέῳξέν σου τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς;

1:16 ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ πληρώματος αὐτοῦ ...

and points out that the Syriac particle which is used in these passages in the Syriac versions may have a relative sense.

---

26 cf. Bauer, Wörterbuch, s.v.
27 AOFG, pp.76-77, Montgomery, Origin, p.21.

This last argument amounts to no more than to say that the Syriac particle has the same ambiguity as the Aramaic.[28] The Greek relative was often used with causal force,[29] and it therefore follows that ὅτι frequently appears where ὅς would cause no difficulty in the Greek.

A large number of passages could be quoted from Hellenistic Greek in which ὅτι could be translated as a relative, and has been translated as a relative. To emphasize the fact that such occurrences have no value as an indication of translation from an Aramaic original, attention is called to the following passages in Epictetus and the papyri, in each of which the translation of ὅτι as a relative is very feasible.

Epict. I 29.49 ταῦτα μέλλεις μαρτυρεῖν καὶ καταισχύνειν τὴν κλῆσιν ἣν κέκληκεν, ὅτι σε ἐτίμησεν ταύτην τὴν τιμὴν καὶ ἄξιον ἡγήσατο προσαγαγεῖν εἰς μαρτυρίαν τηλικαύτην

Epict. II 15.18 ἐσώθην, ὅτι οὐ κέκρικας ἐμὲ ἀποκτεῖναι.

Note the resumption of the relative ὅτι by the personal pronoun ἐμέ!

Epict. III 1.20 πεύσομαι ταῦτα ἃ καὶ νῦν πυθάνομαι, πόλυ δὲ μάλιστα ὑμῶν, φησί, τῶν πολιτῶν, ὅτι ἐγγυτέρω μου γένει ἐστέ.'

---

28 Allis, PTR, p.542f.
29 cf. p. 122.
30 Mrs. Carter translates: "...who hath conferred...".

BGU II 423 (Letter ii AD) line 6f. Εὐχαριστῶ τῷ Κυρίῳ Σεράπιδι, ὅτι μου κινδύνευσαντες εἰς θάλασσαν ἔσωσε εὐθέως.

Epict. III 1.37 τὸν ἄνθρωπον ποιήσει λέγειν σοι ταῦτα, ἵν' ἀγνοῇς τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ δαιμονίου, ὅτι τοῖς μὲν οὕτως, τοῖς δ' ἐκείνως σημαίνει[31]

cf. Epict. IV 7.21; 10:5; 11.23; P Oxy I 113 (Letter ii AD) line 27.

It should perhaps be stated again that this is not to argue that ὅτι in the passages cited in Jn should be translated as a relative, but only that passages in which ὅτι can be translated as a relative occur in the unquestioned Greek writings contemporaneous with Jn; and that, therefore, such occurrences in Jn cannot be of much value as evidences of mistranslation. For if it were to be shown that the translation of ὅτι as a relative would give a superior translation, this would not--considering the passages cited above--make resource to the theory of an Aramaic original necessary.[32]

5.(πᾶν) ὅ = ‏מן‏ **"who"**

The relative has been recognized as a mistranslation by Burney in each of the following passages in Jn:

10:29 ὁ πατήρ μου ὃ δέδωκέν μοι πάντων μεῖζόν ἐστιν

17:11 ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι.

17:12 ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι.

---

31 Mrs. Carter translates: "which declares its significations to different persons..."

32 Montgomery noted the remarkable position of ἐγώ in 8:45; cf. the position of σύ in Epict. IV 13.5.

17:24 πατήρ, ὃ δέδωκάς μοι θέλω ἵνα ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ κἀκεῖνοι ὦσιν μετ' ἐμοῦ.

17:2 ἵνα πᾶν ὃ δέδωκας αὐτῷ δώσει αὐτοῖς ζωήν...

6:37 πᾶν ὃ δίδωσίν μοι ὁ πατὴρ πρὸς ἐμὲ ἥξει.

6:39 ἵνα πᾶν ὃ δέδωκέν μοι μὴ ἀπολέσω ἐξ αὐτοῦ

The first four of these are claimed as a mistranslation in gender and number, which are not expressed by the Aramaic particle דִּי ; the others are explained on the basis of the Hebrew כֹּל "with neutral suffix--'the whole of it' 'all of them', 'every one'. So Isa. 1:23; Jer. 6:13; Ex. 14:7; Isa. 9:16; 15:3; Jer. 8:6,10 etc."[33]

KG states classical usage as follows: "das Relativpronomen steht ohne Rücksicht auf das Geschlecht seines Substantivs in der Neutralform des Singulars wenn der Begriff d des Substantivs nicht als ein individueller, sondern als ein allgemeiner aufzufassen ist;" and it quotes S. Or.542; Eur. Hel. 1687; Pl.Conv. 196,a; Ibid 3,104.[34]

Similarly in Hellenistic Greek, the neuter singular relative often refers to an antecedent of a different gender or number; e.g.,

Epict. II 14.3 καὶ τὰ μὲν ἀπὸ τῶν τεχνῶν γινόμενα τήν τε χρείαν εὐθὺς ἐνδείκνυται πρὸς ὃ γέγονεν.

BGU I 257 (Rent Contract 138 AD) line 4f. ὃ περὶ [πτο]λεμαίδος Ν[έας] μητρικ[ας?] ὑμῶν μετρητὰς τ[εσσ]αρες

---

33 AOFG, p.101f.
34 KG § 361,2. cf. Smyth, Grammar, p.204.

P Lond II 142 (Receipt 95 AD) line 7 δραχμας χειλιας διακοσιας τεσσαρακοντα κ. τους τουτων τοκους α ωφιλεν αυτωι

Epict. I 6.40 ὅ γε θεὸς οὐ μόνον ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν τὰς δυνάμεις ταύτας, καθ' ἃς... ἀλλ' ἀκώλυτον τοῦτο ἔδωκεν.

Ignatius, Rom. 5.1 Ἀπὸ Συρίας μέχρι Ῥώμης θηριομαχῶ... δεδεμένος δέκα λεοπάρδοις, ὅ ἐστιν στρατιωτικὸν τάγμα· οἳ καὶ εὐεργετούμενοι χείρους γίνονται.

It should be noted that in the last of these examples, we have an approximate parallel to Jn 17:24, "where the translator was capable of reproducing ? by a neuter, and then completing the relative by a masculine."

There is no space in a work of this kind to take up each of these passages in Jn in detail and argue from the exegetical viewpoint for or against Burney's claims.[35] It may be worth noting, however, that in the passages cited as examples in the Hebrew O.T. of the Semitic idiom behind the last three Johannine passages, the LXX <u>never</u> translates the "Hebrew neutral suffix" by a neuter singular: πάντες and πᾶς τις occur, but not πᾶν ὅ. If there is, formally, no neuter gender in Semitic, what led "the translator" to choose the neuter gender in these passages? Is it possible, in that case, to regard the neuter as significant of Aramaic influence?

As a matter of fact, the construction with πᾶν finds a parallel in the Discourses:

III 20.15 πᾶν ὃ ἂν δῶς, ἐγὼ αὐτὸ ποιήσω μακάριον.

It may be that what led Jn to use the neuter with πᾶν was

---

35 cf. JG 1921,2422.

the naturalness of the construction to one writing in Greek.

6. ὅς = ד "because"

This mistranslation has been found in two verses of the Prologue by Burney.[36] His arguments--somewhat abridged--are as follows:

> In 1:4 ὃ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν, the Aramaic equivalent would be (הוא) בידה חיין הוה. Here the opening ד answering to 'that which', might equally well bear the meaning 'inasmuch as', 'since', 'because'.(cf. Dan. 2:41,2:20). The Hebrew relative אשר often bears the same sense...
>
> 1:13 οἳ οὐκ ἐξ αἱμάτων... ἐγεννήθησαν, i.e. יהב הוא. Since ד is invariable, it was probably sing. in Aramaic referring to "He gave"...Very probably ד may not have had this relative sense at all, but (as in v.4) may have been intended to express the sense 'inasmuch as', thus giving the reason why the fact previously mentioned became possible... The writer is drawing out the mystical import of the Virgin Birth for believers...

One cannot escape the impression that there is something more than linguistic interest behind such an argument; there is certainly nothing "difficult"or "peculiar" in the Greek. In the first instance cited, the argument about the point of sentence division may have suggested the mistranslation to Burney. "In neither instance is there any necessity for this explanation of the relative pronoun."[37] And Allis has noted that "the Syriac versions clearly support the reading of the Greek, except that the uncertainty as to the point of division between vss. 3 and 4 makes the Peshitto ambiguous."[38]

But if it were true that in each of these passages

---

36 AOFG,pp.29,34. 37 MH II iii. p.436. 38 PTR,p.544

the Greek relative carried a causal force, that would be no argument against regarding the passages as composition Greek. This use of the relative is well attested for classical Greek by Goodwin, who quotes,

Hdt. i.33 Δόξας ἀμαθέα εἶναι, ὅς...ἐκέλευε

believing him to be unlearned, because he commanded

and Xen. Mem. II 7,13; Hdt. i.31; Plato 58 E; and many other passages from Greek literature.[39]

That this construction is also found in Hellenistic Greek is shown by the following examples from the Discourses:

II 6.20 ἐγὼ δ' οὐ κινδυνεύω, ὃς οἰκῶ ἐν Νικοπόλει, ὅπου σεισμοὶ τοσοῦτοι;[40]

IV 10.16 ὃ μὲ σὺ ἐγέννησας, χάριν ἔχω, ὧν ἔδωκας· ἐφ' ὅσον ἐχρησάμην τοῖς σοῖς ἀρκεῖ μοι.

It would seem, then, that whether the relative in the passages quoted by Burney has a causal force or not, there is nothing in it that is unusual as Greek.

7. ἔν for "this"

This is yet another instance in which Burney ignored the definition of mistranslation which he himself established. He suggests that the ἓν οἶδα of 9:25, "i.e. זֶה יָדַעְתִּי may well be an error for יָדַעְתִּי זֶה 'This I know'; and th this is actually the reading of Palestinian Syriac."[41] He

---

39 Moods and Tenses, p.220. cf. KG # 554.
40 "by living in Nicopolis"--Oldfather.
41 AOFG, p.112.

admits, however, that ἓν οἶδα yields a suitable sense. Since he advances no argument for הָרָה as yielding a more suitable sense, and does not attack the possibility of ἓν οἶδα as good Greek, the weakness of his position is apparent.

8. τὰ ῥήματα = "the things"

Jn 6:63 τὰ ῥήματα ἃ ἐγὼ λελάληκα ὑμῖν seems to Burney[42] to mean "The things about which I have been speaking to you." He points out that Aramaic מִלָּה like Hebrew דָּבָר means both "word" and "thing". He quotes from Theodotion's version

Dan. 2:8 ἀπέστη ἀπ' ἐμοῦ τὸ ῥῆμα,

and from the LXX

2 Sam. 12:6 ἀνθ' ὧν ὅτι ἐποίησεν τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο.

The facts to which he calls attention are indisputable. מִלָּה and דָּבָר have a double meaning and frequently are translated by λόγος or ῥῆμα in Theodotion and LXX where the obvious meaning is "thing"--as in the passages quoted by Burney.

This very frequency is one of the arguments against Burney's position. In less than fifteen chapters of Genesis, ῥῆμα occurs as a mistranslation of דָּבָר at least half a dozen times. But in Jn, Burney claims but this one passage and "perhaps" 6:68 ῥήματα ζωῆς αἰωνίου.

---

42 AOFG, p.108f.

Another argument against Burney's claim lies in the nature of the verb with which ῥήματα is used. In the LXX, as in Theodotion, it is used with verbs which have nothing whatever to do with speaking. That is to say, in the translation-Greek which we have, there are clear uses of ῥῆμα in Semitic fashion with verbs which demand "thing" as their object. No such use occurs in Jn, and Burney is driven to suspect ῥῆμα of meaning "thing" when it is the object of a verb of speaking! With what sort of a verb would he expect ῥῆμα to be used so as to mean "word"?

9. ἦν = "he"

"Jn 1:9 ἦν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινον can only mean, says Burney, 'It was the true light', referring to the preceeding verse. For this sense we seem to need a demonstrative pronoun; and this probably stood in Aramaic as הוא which was misread היה and rendered ἦν.[43]

Torrey says of Burney's suggestion here that "it seems most improbable because of the preceeding verse. His conjectured הוא would naturally refer to John the Baptist even in the text which he restores."[44]

Allis points out that there can be no question of the correctness of ἦν τὸ φῶς, which is not attacked by Burney; and it does not seem necessary to quote passages to illustrate such a common Greek construction. The desperate nature of

---

43 AOFG, p.33. 44 Review, p.329

Burney's argument is stated as follows by Allis:

We have seen that elsewhere Dr. Burney insists that the "excessive" use of the independent pronoun as subject is Aramaic. Here, conversely, he argues that its absence is suspicious. Dr. Burney is clearly a somewhat captious critic of the Greek text which he is investigating." 45

10.Imperfect for Pluperfect

In regard to ἔλεγεν in Jn 2:22, ὅτε οὖν ἠγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐμνήσθησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι τοῦτο ἔλεγεν, Burney says: "We note the curious use of the imperfect, 'He was saying', where the context demands a pluperfect, 'He had said'."46 This is due, he thinks, to the fact that it translates the Aramaic אֲמַר הֲוָה "He had said", which in the unvocalized text was confused by the translator with הֲוָה אָמַר "He was saying".

An imperfect in indirect discourse after a verb of remembering would not seem strange to Greek ears, for it is a rule of Greek grammar that in indirect discourse the verb keeps the tense of the direct.47 Several other factors would make this sound natural to Hellenistic Greeks: in the first place, the pluperfect tense was becoming more and more of a rarity; in the second, the imperfect of λέγω was often used without any thought of expressing continuing action.48 This leads Pernot to say, "Il n'est pas juste non plus de dire que l'emploie de l'imparfait, au lieu du plus-

---

45 PTR, pp.564-565.
46 AOFG, p.108.
47 Radermacher, Grammatik, p.156.
48 cf. above p.23

que-parfait,...est surprenant. C'est au contraire l'emploie du plus-que-parfait qui le serait."[49]

11. καταλαμβάνω for "darken"

In regard to the use of this verb in 1:5 and 12:35, Burney follows the suggestion of Dr.Ball "that confusion may have arisen in Aramaic between the Aphel form akbel 'darken' and the Pael form kabbel meaning 'receive', 'take'."[50]

This suggestion has not met with general approval. Torrey says, "In 1,5 and 12,35 (even without the added difficulty of supposing that the same rather unlikely blunder was made twice),...I very decidedly prefer the present readings to those which Burney proposes."[51] This preference is shared by Bernard[52] and Allis[53] who point out that the argument is not based on grammatical form but on subject matter, and that the passage is easily paralleled in other Greek writings.[54] Walter Bauer feels that the meaning is, "die Finsternis hat es nicht ergriffen, wobei d. ergreifen in d. begreifen hinuberspielt."[55] And he gives a list of references for the latter meaning from classical and Hellenistic Greek.

An interesting parallel to the use of this verb in Jn is found in Epictetus:

---

49 Revue,p.128.
50 AOFG,p.29f.
51 Review,p.328.
52 ST.John i.,p.6.
53 PTR,p.563.
54 Field, Notes p.84, quotes Herod I 87 in which Blakesly finds the meaning "extinguish" for this verb.
55 Wörterbuch,s.v.; Das Joh-Ev.,s.v. 1:5.

III 5.7 οὐκ οἶδας, ὅτι καὶ νόσος καὶ θάνατος καταλαβεῖν ἡμᾶς ὀφείλουσιν τί ποτε ποιοῦντας;

cf. III 5.11; II 22.28.

There can be no doubt of the soundness of Burrow's judgement that "Burney has been led astray by Ball's theory that κατέλαβεν is a mistranslation."[56]

12.Jn 7:37-38

The difficulty in this passage for Burney is not due alone to peculiarities of language:

> the fact remains that this as expressed cannot be connected with any O.T. passage,...and we cannot believe that He (Jesus) would have imported, or that they (his hearers) would have accepted, an idea which is not found in any O.T. passage which speaks of the water of life.[57]

With the supposition that בֶּטֶן "belly" was read by mistake for מְקוֹר "fountain", and a redivision of the clauses, Burney secures the following as the original meaning: "He that thirsteth let him come unto me; and let him drink that believeth in me. As the Scripture hath said, 'Rivers shall flow forth from the fountain of living waters.'"

Torrey says of this, "But Burney's restored Aramaic is too far removed from the Greek, too improbable in itself, and not sufficiently like anything in the Old Testament."[58]

Torrey's own assumption is that מְקוֹר was read by error for מְעִי and that the original read, "If any man

---

56 "The Johannine Prologue as Aramaic Verse", JBL 45, p.61.

57 AOFG, pp.109-121.

58 Review, p.328.

thirst, let him come unto me; and let him drink who believeth on me. As the Scripture hath said, 'Out of the midst of her (i.e. Jerusalem) shall flow rivers of living water.'"[59] He finds here a plain reference to Zech. 14:8.

Rendel Harris sees it as a quotation of Zech. 14:8 with Jer. 3:17, with confusion of Syriac Karsa "belly" and Kurs^{e}ya "throne".[60]

MH calls attention to explanations which "dispense with any emendation of the Greek text, by W.E.Barnes[61] and H. St.J.Thackeray[62].[63]

Walter Bauer's decision that the reference to the OT is "jedoch nicht mehr identifizierbar"[64] seems reasonable enough in view of the welter of contradictory opinions.[65]

The various Semitic originals suggested for this passage are about on a par; there is some degree of possibility in all of them; there is nothing compelling in any of them. Torrey's reconstruction is also "too improbable in itself". Lagrange has pointed out[66] that his reconstruction drags Jerusalem into a context with which it has nothing to do.

Difficulties in the text of an ancient document do not demand the theory of mistranslation; it is only when that theory clears up the difficulties in a most convincing

---

59 Review, pp.339-340.
60 quoted in MH II iii, p.475.
61 JTS xxiii., 421.
62 The LXX and Jewish Worship, p.66f.
63 MH II iii., p.475.
64 Wörterbuch, s.v.
65 cf. Loisy, La Quatrieme Evangile, l.c.; Lagrange, S.Jean, l.c.; W.Bauer, Das Joh-Ev., l.c.

fashion that the theory is justified. Interestingly enough, Epictetus' translators have found difficulty in a passage in which he uses the word κοιλία:

II 16.44 ἀλλ' ἐν βοὸς κοιλίᾳ καθήμενος ἐκδέχου σου τὴν μάμμην, μέχρις σε χορτάσῃ.[67]

This is an interesting demonstration of the fact that difficult passages may exist where there is no possibility of an Aramaic original.

13. Οἴδαμεν for "I know"

"The strange use of οὐκ οἴδαμεν, 20:2, in the mouth of Mary Magdalen, where we should expect οὐκ οἶδα, may be due to a misreading אנחנו ידענו (1st plur. pf.) of an original אנא ידעת (fem. sg. Participle combined with 1st pers. pronoun)."[68] Burney, who gives this explanation, suggests its possibility for the same phenomenon in Jn 3:2.

Torrey regards this usage as "quite correct" and "an illustration of the characteristic delicacy in the use of the personal pronouns...in the Semitic languages." He admits that "The same substitution is well known in Greek...and is natural wherever the same feeling exists."[69]

The demonstration of this last statement is merely a matter of selecting the evidence. Practically every grammar

---

66 S.Jean, l.c.
67 cf. Mrs.Carter's translation and note; also Long's translation, and Upton's and Oldfather's text.
68 Burney, AOFG, p.112f.
69 Review, p.329.

and Greek Syntax yields examples from classical Greek.[70] Gildersleeve gives numerous examples of the 1st pers. plural for the 1st pers. sing. in which "the particular is sunk in the generic, the individual in the class, the woman in her male kindred."[71] And in tragedy, this was carried to such an extent that "plural and singular may be used of the same person in the same sentence."[72]

The same condition exists in Hellenistic Greek. K. Dick has given some examples from Hellenistic literature and from the papyri,[73] which in Moulton's judgement prove "that 'I' and 'We' chased each other throughout these documents without rhyme or reason."[74]

The rapid interchange of singular and plural in the Discourses surpasses anything in Jn. I 5.3-5 uses "we" throughout; I 5.6-10 uses "I". I 6.37 begins Ἄγε οὖν καὶ σὺ τούτων αἰσθόμενος ἀπόβλεψον...and continues in the sing.; but I 6.38 begins abruptly οὔ· ἀλλὰ κάθησθε and continues in the plural. Note the change in the passages below:

I 30.6-7 Τί οὕτως μεγάλα καὶ πολλὰ παρασκευαζόμεθα πρὸς τὸ μηδέν; τοῦτο ἦν ἡ ἐξουσία;...τούτων ἕνεκα τοὺς πολλοὺς λόγους ἤκουον; ταῦτα οὐδὲν ἦν, ἐγὼ δ' ὡς μεγάλα παρεσκευαζόμην.

I 1.10,12 Ἀλλὰ τί λέγει ὁ Ζεύς; Ἐπίκτητε, εἰ οἷόν

---

70 WM,p.725;KG # 371,3;Blass # 48,4(cited by Torrey).
71 Syntax i.,p.27.
72 Smyth, Grammar,p.198, # 704.
73 Der Schriftstellerische Plural bei Paulus,pp.15-32.
74 Prolegomena,p.86.

τε ἦν, καὶ τὸ σωμάτιον ἀν σου καὶ τὸ κτησίδιον ἐποίησα ἐλεύθερον καὶ ἀπαραπόδιστον...ἐπεὶ δὲ τοῦτο οὐκ ἠδυνάμην, ἐδώκαμέν σοι μέρος τι ἡμέτερον[75]

To the passages cited from the papyri by Milligan[76] to prove that the two numbers could be used interchangeably, the following may be added:

P Oxy XII 1479 (Letter i BC) line 2f. ἐκομισάμην... εἴλη φ(α)...[ε]ἰρήκαμεν...

translated as "I received...I obtained...I told..." by the Editors.

P Oxy VII 1061 (Letter 22 BC) line 1f. Διογέν[η]ς Διονυσίωι τῶι ἀδελφῶι...ἐπειδὴ καὶ ἄλλοτέ σοι ἐγράψαμεν... διαφέρετε...ἔγραψα.

P Lond II 331 (Temporary Appointment 165 AD) line 12f. παραδωσω...παρελαβομην...ποιησομεθα...δωσωμεν...

BGU II 449 (Letter ii/iii AD) line 4f. ἀκούσας ὅτι νωθρευη ἀγωνιοῦμεν.

cf. P Oxy II 298 (Letter i AD), P Oxy XIV 1761 (Letter ii/iii AD), P Oxy XII 1481 (Letter ii AD) line 6.

When to the various uses of the plural for singular which have been mentioned and illustrated here, one adds that identification of the evangelist with the Christian community which is found in Jn,[77] it is not surprising that in some passages in Jn the plural should be used for the sing.

---

75 For other passages in Epictetus, cf. K. Dick, op.cit.
76 Thess., p.131f.; cf. MM, Vocab., s.v. ἐγω.
77 cf. Bernard, St. John i., p.110.

14.Change from Direct to Indirect Speech

In 20:18, Ἔρχεται ἡ Μαρίαμ ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ ἀγγέλλουσα ...ὅτι Ἑώρακα τὸν κύριον καὶ ταῦτα εἶπεν αὐτῇ, Burney[78] finds the change from direct to oblique oration strange and awkward. With the supposition that the Ara. הֲוָת was misread as חֲוַת he restores the original as "announcing that she had seen the Lord, and that He had spoken, etc."[79]

The change from indirect to direct discourse, and more infrequently from direct to indirect, was known to classical Greek; e.g.,

X. An. 7.1,39 ἐλθὼν δ' ὁ Κλέανδρος· Μάλα μόλις, ἔφη, διαπραξάμενος ἥκω· λέγειν γὰρ Ἀναξίβιον, ὅτι οὐκ ἐπιτήδειον εἴη κτλ.[80] This may explain why Walter Bauer found here no difficulty demanding explanation, a fact which Torrey is willing to accept as guarantee of the quality of the Greek.

15.John 8:56

No extension of the use of ἵνα seemed to Burney adequate to explain ἠγαλλιάσατο ἵνα ἴδῃ, and he felt that the similarity of the following clause demanded some such meaning as "longed", for ἠγαλλιάσατο. This he found in a

---

78 AOFG,p.113.

79 Torrey, Review,p.330, says, "I think...that the text which Burney would emend in 20:18 is quite correct, seeing that such sudden alternations of direct and indirect discourse are a common phenomenon in Semitic writings." This would take this out of the category of mistranslations.

80 KG # 595,5; BD # 470; WM, p.725.

Syriac verb, not known to occur in Western Aramaic, which carried both the meaning "longed" and "exulted".[81]

The repetition in the following clause struck Torrey as a tautology that could not have been in the original. But since "the verb which Burney supposes here is not known to have occurred in Western Aramaic, and (if its use was like that in Syriac) would not easily have been misunderstood," he refuses Burney's reconstruction and resorts to the textual history of the Ara. gospel of Jn to solve the problem. The author wrote אברהם בעא "Abraham prayed"; then the final א of אבעא "was omitted in copying, partly because of the immediately following א, partly because 'Abraham exulted to see my day' seemed such a probable saying."[82] This rests on several assumptions:first, that what was impossible for the author would have seemed "such a probable saying " to the copyist; second, the occurrence of the form אבע.[83]

The use of ἵνα after verbs of wishing, striving,etc., is regarded by Bauer as sufficient to explain the passage: he translates ἠγαλλιάσατο "jubelnd streben nach".[84] Jannaris claims that "the use of ἵνα in the sense of a causal participle or ὅτι, <u>because,since, for</u>, especially after expressions of <u>emotion</u>"[85] is peculiar but unmistakable in

---

81 <u>AOFG</u>,p.111.

82 <u>Review</u>,pp.340-341.

83 Lagrange, <u>S.Jean</u>, <u>l.c.</u>, says, "Mais si la forme אבע a existe, il faudrait toujours s'etonner quelle ait supplante dans l'esprit du traducteur une forme tres commune et en situation."

84 <u>Wörterbuch</u>, <u>s.v.</u> ἀγγαλλ.

85 <u>Hist. Gram.</u>, # 1741.

Greek usage from B.C. 150 on; and he cites this passage as an example.[86] Many of his examples, however, admit of other explanations.[87]

The justification of the Johannine passage as Greek is to be seen in the following passages from the papyri:

BGU 1081:5 (iii AD) ἐχάρην ἵνα σὲ ἀσπάζομαι.[88]

Pap Giess 17:5 (ii AD) ἠγωνίασα... ἵνα ἀκούσω.[89]

These examples and the established wide use of ἵνα in the Koine make it possible to agree with MH that "In any case Burney's suspicion of an Aramaism in the ἵνα-clause is needless."[90]

There remains as an argument against the Greek of th this passage only the claim that the author would not have been guilty of such "tautology". But such repetition is one of the outstanding characteristics of the author's style; cf. 3:31;6:53-59; etc.

Montgomery has called attention to this tautology in Jn 12:49 τί εἴπω καὶ τί λαλήσω, and concludes that although "Rhetorical parallelism, characteristic of the Semitic, might explain this duplication,...the case looks strikingly like a doublet in translation, to be compared with the in-

---

86 Sharp takes the same position in this passage, translating ἵνα "because" as he does in Epict. III 4.10.

87 H. Windisch, ZNTW 26 (1927),p.206.

88 quoted by Bauer, Das Joh-Ev.,s.v. 8:56.

89 quoted by BD # 292,1a. cf. Jn 18:36.

90 II iii.,p.476, where examples of this use of ἵνα are quoted from Mgr by Dr.McKinlay.

numerable doublets in the LXX."[91] If repetition here is characteristically Semitic, it cannot be impossible in 8:56. The explanation of 12:49 is, of course, the same as that of 8:56; 3:31, etc., where the author of the Fourth Gospel shows his fondness for repetitious phrases. Greek authors were differentiated by individual stylistic differences, and the best explanation of these two passages in Jn is that repetition is one of the favorite mechanisms of the author of the spiritual gospel.[92]

As Montgomery's thesis does not demand a written Aramaic original for Jn, he prefaces his list of "mistranslations" with a cautious statement pointing out that the establishment of mistranslations is not essential to his position. In his opinion other criteria are more important. His mistranslations follow.

16.Jn 11:54 ἐν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις

This phrase seems to Montgomery to stand for "in Judea". "The Peshitto Syriac uses here the idiomatic phrase, beth Iudays, 'in the house', i.e. 'the land of the Jews'... For beth the translator may have read or understood be, 'in', and so produced 'in the Jews'."[93]

Gildersleeve's discussion suggests that the same construction was known in classical Greek:

---

91 Origin, p. 21.
92 Burney's treatment of 1:29 has not been taken up here as he has no criticism of the Greek.
93 Origin, p. 21.

the name of the inhabitants is sometimes read instead of the city: καὶ κρατήσαντες τοῦ ἐν Δελφοῖς ἱεροῦ παρέδοσαν Δελφοῖς, Thuc 1,112,5; And having made themselves masters of the sanctuary at Delphi (among the Delphians), they handed it over to the Delphians.

Dem.25,34 ἐν Δελφοῖς, and similarly often in Dem.
Xen. An. 1,2,24: ἐν Σολοῖς, καὶ ἐν Ἰσσοῖς .[94]

The same construction after the prepositions ἐκ and ἐς is amply illustrated by the same author from the writings of Isoc., Plato, Hdt., Dem., and Thuc.

Walter Bauer translates this phrase in 11:54 by "unter den Juden", and has no note of any difficulty in the Greek;[95] and the same is true of Lagrange's treatment of this verse.[96]

17. John 8:44

The difficulty attendant upon the determination of the antecedent of αὐτοῦ in the phrase ὅτι ψεύστης ἐστὶν καὶ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ, leads Montgomery to render the phrase into Semitic idiom, where "the phrase would appear as "the son of the lie and its father", a drastically satirical utterance."[97]

The Greek construction <u>ad sensum</u> is usually assumed by commentators and grammarians as adequate explanation of this passage.[98] BD has a paragraph on this construction with αὐτοῦ and classifies this passage in Jn under that heading.

The following passages in the Discourses show a sim-

---

94 <u>Syntax</u> i., p.25.
95 <u>Das Joh-Ev.</u>, <u>l.c.</u>
96 <u>S.Jean</u>, <u>l.c.</u>
97 <u>Origin</u>, p.21.
98 Lagrange, <u>S.Jean</u>, <u>l.c.</u> WM #.181. Bauer, <u>Joh-Ev.</u>, <u>l.c.</u>

ilar use of οὗτος:

I 6.40 καὶτοὶ ὅ γε θεὸς οὐ μόνον ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν τὰς δυνάμεις ταύτας...ἀκώλυτον τοῦτο ἔδωκεν.

cf.I 6.23,etc.

The difficulty in regard to αὐτοῦ would seem, therefore,to be explicable on other grounds than recourse to Semitic idiom.

18.John 8:25

The Greek of this passage τὴν ἀρχὴν ὅτι καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν seems to Montgomery "uncertain and absurd."[99] He works out the following Aramaic original: "What was at first (di bereshith), what (di, represented by ὅτι) also I am saying to you," i.e., I am saying the same thing as from the first.

That this passage has been a stumbling block to many and has been interpreted in many ways is not to be denied.[100] But treating the passage as a question or as an ironical exclamation eliminates the difficulties, and has in its favor the consistent support of the Greek Fathers. It is the interpretation supported by WM, Lagrange, Bauer, and others. This involves the use of ἀρχήν to mean ὅλως a use which was quite common in classical Greek, usually with a negative.[101]

An instance of this use in Hellenistic Greek occurs in the papyri:

---

99 Origin,p.21.

100 WM,p.546. Lagrange,S.Jean,l.c. Bauer, Das Joh-Ev. l.c. Fields, Notes,pp.93-94.

101 KG # 410,Anmerk.5. Bauer, Wörterbuch, s.v. ἀρχήν.

P Oxy III 472 (Speech of an Advocate 130 AD) line 16f. οὐ δύναται γὰρ κεκλέφθαι τὸ μηδ'ἀρχὴν γενόμενον μὴ δύνατὸν δ' εἶναι...
which the Editors translate "...which neither ever existed at all nor could exist..."

Examples of this use without a negative are given in sufficient number in Bauer's commentary.

A weakness of Montgomery's conjecture lies in the fact that it requires the translation of a phrase which really means "from the beginning" by τὴν ἀρχήν. This is possible as Greek, but not probable in Jn, where ἀπ'ἀρχῆς is quite common.

The argument for mistranslation remains, then, here as elsewhere, without that convincing quality so to be desired for the demonstration of mistranslation.

19.John 4:6,13:25 οὕτως

Montgomery mentions this "peculiar usage" rather to raise the question than to answer it. He suggests, however,[102] that the answer may lie in an Aramaic original kadu, "as he was", used often in the Latin sense of iam. Torrey states his view more confidently: "In 4,6 and 13,25 οὕτως is simply the Jewish-Aramaic בְּכֵן 'therefore', 'accordingly'."[103] In a later article[104] Montgomery repudiates his former suggestion

---

102 Origin, p.21.
103 Review, p.343.
104 "Some Aramaisms in the Gospels and Acts" JBL 46 (1927) pp.71-72.

and argues for the Aramaic original of οὕτως in these passages as being wekadu, "only". He finds an instance of this use in the 14th century text of the Life of Mar Yaballaha III.

Which of these conjectures best suits Aramaic usage may be left to the scholars in that field to determine; that οὕτως as here used was good Greek usage is beyond question. In classical Greek οὕτως was used in two somewhat similar ways to mean either "merely so", "as he was",etc., or, after participles, to take up again the idea of the participle. Numerous examples of both are given in LS, and other lexicons and grammars; e.g.,

Phaed. 61,d καὶ καθεζόμενος οὕτως ἤδη τὰ λοιπὰ διελέγετο.

Aen. 6,104 ἀποφυγὼν δὲ καὶ τούτους στρατηγὸς οὕτω Ἀθηναίων ἀπεδέχθη.[105]

Walter Bauer asserts that if οὕτως were the pleonastic reference to a preceding participle, it would have to precede verb, citing Acts 20:11;27:17;Jos.Ant.I 22.1;IX 6.4; Plutarch Cleom.37 p.822; Galba 7 p.1055, in support of his claim. He concludes therefore that οὕτως here is equivalent to ὡς ἁπλῶς and ὡς ἔτυχε.[106]

But that οὕτως need not always precede the verb when it refers to a preceding participle is shown by the following passage in Epictetus:

---

105 Quoted by KG # 486,1,Anmerk.5, cf. Bauer, Wörterbuch, s.v.; WM p.772 ; Pallis, St.John and the Apocalypse, p.8; Field, Notes,p.87; JG # 1916-1917; etc.

106 Das Joh-Ev., s.v.4:6.

II 8.20 καὶ ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ ἡ Φειδίου ἄπαξ ἐκτείνασα τὴν χεῖρα καὶ τὴν Νίκην ἐπ' αὐτῆς δεξαμένη ἕστηκεν οὕτως ὅλῳ τῷ αἰῶνι.

Another instance of οὕτως used as in Jn 4:6 and 13:25 is

Epict IV 1.116 πῶς δὲ παθεὶς ἀνεστρέφετο πρὸς τὸν δεσπότην· εὐθὺς διελέγετο πρὸς αὐτὸν, ὅτι οὐχ οὕτως ἐστολίσθαι δεῖ αὐτὸν, οὐχ οὕτως κεκάρθαι...

where Mrs.Carter translates "...that he ought not to be dressed or shaved in the manner he was."

Cadbury, in a study of this use of this word in Acts which shows--against BD--that it need not be a mark of classical culture, has shown its currency in the papyri.[107] He quotes, with other examples,

P Lond I 106 (A complaint of assault iii BC) line 19 ἐμοῦ δὲ οὐκ ἐκχωροῦντος ἀλλ' ἐπιμαρτυρομένου τοὺς παρόντας καὶ συνδραμόντων πλειόνων καὶ ἐπιτιμώντων αὐτῷ οὕτως ἀπηλλάγη.

The conclusion seems inescapable that Jn's usage is paralleled in classical and Hellenistic Greek. Indeed the difficulty in regard to this passages is caused by an embarass de richesse, for οὕτως was used so commonly and so freely that two slightly-different constructions developed, both of which have been claimed by Greek scholars for Jn. A resort to Aramaic idiom here seems unnecessary.

---

107 "Lexical Notes on Luke-Acts. I" JBL 44 (1925) p.223.

Any detailed treatment of the "mistranslations" advanced by Torrey seems unnecessary in this study since he himself admits that "in no one of the passages discussed is it necessary...to postulate singular usage.[108] Several of these passages where Torrey picked the same passage as Burney or Montgomery have already been discussed: 7:37;8:56;4:6 and 13:25. In the other passages it may be worth while to note Lagrange's comment[109] on Torrey's suggestions.

In 11:33,38, he claims a meaning for the Greek which would make Torrey's suggestion unnecessary, and points out that the error supposed by Torrey occurs twice in the same context, "qui suggerait plutot l'emotion". In 7:3, he rejects Torrey's conjecture as useless. In 14:2, he ignores it. In 14:31, he quotes Torrey's restoration with the comment: "C'est tres ingenieux, mais combien moins naturel que le text grec!" In 20:17, he regards the passage as restored by Torrey as "une redondance sans signification." He ignores the three or four brief suggestions of mistranslations in Torrey's last paragraph--an example which the author of this study feels justified in following in view of their brevity, general insignificance, and non-linguistic nature.

One of the mistranslations for which Torrey argues at length, 14:31, deserves notice in connection with his claim that in "no one of the passages is it necessary to suppose carelessness or obtuseness on the part of either

---

108 Review,p.344. 109 S.Jean,ll.c.

copyist or translator."[110] He reconstructs the original Aramaic of the end of verse 31 as עָבְדָה לְיוּדָאי מִלְּתָא and concludes that it was easy for the copyist to write מִלְּתָא לְיוּדָאי which our Greek translates. Yet he earlier[111] took issue with Burney on the possibility of a translator mistaking מִלְּתָא with מַלְכָּא:

It is interesting to note that as Torrey dealt with Burney's mistranslations, so has Lagrange dealt with Torrey's; and one would almost be justified in quoting Torrey's conclusion on Burney's attempts as an epitaph for Torrey's own work in this connection: "Among those who are inclined to demand in John what Burney demands in Mark (some cogent evidence of mistranslation), I think the verdict is likely to be, 'Not proven'."[112]

---

110 Review, l.c.
111 Reveiw, p.329.
112 Review, p.332.

CONCLUSION

In Chapters I & II, fifty-four "Semitisms" in Jn were studied in connection with the attempt to find parallels in the papyri of the Roman period and the Discourses of Epictetus. Parallels to 40 of these have been given from Epictetus or the papyri or both. Parallels from classical Greek have been given in the case of 31 of these "Semitisms". No adequate parallels from any of these three sources have been given in the case of 8 "Semitisms".[1]

The 8 "Semitisms" are as follows: (1) ὕδατος ζῶντος (2) Infrequency of Genitive Absolute (3) ἵνα ὑπάγητε καὶ καρπὸν φέρητε (4) οὐκ ἄνθρωπος (5) οὐ μὴ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα (6) υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας (7) εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω (8) ἐκ with Genitive as a subject; and the frequent use of ἵνα and ἵνα μή might be included. There are of course other phrases and words in Jn that are Semitic in origin,[2] i.e., the phrase ἀπεκρίθη καὶ εἶπεν is a Semitic phrase even though its asyndeton use in Jn is easily paralleled.

Of these 8, parallels from Christian literature composed in Greek have been cited for 5: (1) (2) (5) (6) (7).

---

1 This is not to say that parallels could not be found in all three of these sources for many more of these Semitisms. The parallels from classical Greek were purely a side issue in this study: a reductio ad absurdam of the Semitic scholars' argument that these constructions were "hardly" Greek. And in the case of Epictetus and the papyri also, the evidence is incomplete, the large number of constructions studied making it impossible even to attempt completeness.

2 Lagrange, S.Jean, p.cxvi., gives a list.

CONCLUSION

In Chapters I & II, fifty-four "Semitisms" in Jn were studied in connection with the attempt to find parallels in the papyri of the Roman period and the Discourses of Epictetus. Parallels to 40 of these have been given from Epictetus or the papyri or both. Parallels from classical Greek have been given in the case of 31 of these "Semitisms". No adequate parallels from any of these three sources have been given in the case of 8 "Semitisms".[1]

The 8 "Semitisms" are as follows: (1) ὕδατος ζῶντος (2) Infrequency of Genitive Absolute (3) ἵνα ὑπάγητε καὶ καρπὸν φέρητε (4) οὐκ ἄνθρωπος (5) οὐ μὴ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα (6) υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας (7) εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω (8) ἐκ with Genitive as a subject; and the frequent use of ἵνα and ἵνα μή might be included. There are of course other phrases and words in Jn that are Semitic in origin,[2] i.e., the phrase ἀπεκρίθη καὶ εἶπεν is a Semitic phrase even though its asyndeton use in Jn is easily paralleled.

Of these 8, parallels from Christian literature composed in Greek have been cited for 5: (1) (2) (5) (6) (7).

---

1 This is not to say that parallels could not be found in all three of these sources for many more of these Semitisms. The parallels from classical Greek were purely a side issue in this study: a reductio ad absurdam of the Semitic scholars' argument that these constructions were "hardly" Greek. And inthe case of Epictetus and the papyri also, the evidence is incomplete, the large number of constructions studied making it impossible even to attempt completeness.

2 Lagrange, S.Jean, p.cxvi., gives a list.

Paul's letters, the Didache, and especially the Shepherd of Hermas, have most of these, as well as many other "Semitisms" which do not occur in Jn. There are finally, 3 or 4 constructions for which no adequate parallel has been presented: (3) (4) and (8). In such a situation, something qualitative and convincing is needed to bolster up the "cumulative argument" of those who plead for an Aramaic original of Jn.[3]

That there is anything particularly Semitic in even these few cases seems impossible in view of the lack of agreement as to the Aramaisms in Jn among the champions of the theory that a knowledge of Aramaic explains its Greek. The majority of the 54 "Semitisms" were taken from the work of Burney and Montgomery, only 7 coming from Torrey's article and three of these being duplicated in the work of either Burney or Montgomery. The work of Montgomery and Burney was done independently; and as each feels that the "Semitisms" which he advocates could not escape the notice of an Aramaic scholar, a comparison of their findings should be significant.

There are 29 "Semitisms" from Burney's list, and 22 from Montgomery's. They independently picked the same "Semitism" twice! But their agreement is not even as high as that. In regard to one of these two, The Use of the Historical Present, Burney is sure that its frequency is due to the Aramaic participle, but Montgomery is uncertain whether

---

3 Cf. Cadbury's sound statement of this need, Journal of Theology XXIV. 445f.

it is an Aramaism or good Greek usage. The extent of their agreement is that ὄνομα αὐτῷ is due to Semitic influence.[4] This astonishing lack of agreement is an indication of the unconvincing nature of the "Aramaisms" in Jn, and the lack of objectivity in the method employed by the Semitic scholars.

Torrey's work is of course based on Burney's, and he admits that the main body of Burney's argument (covered in Chapters I & II of this study) is for him conclusive proof of the Aramaic origin of Jn. But this does not mean that if Torrey had independently established a list of "Semitisms" in Jn, they would have paralleled Burney's list any more exactly than Montgomery's do. In fact, nothing would have been more improbable, for Torrey could not have followed the method which Burney used to establish his "Semitisms". Burney detected Aramaisms in Jn by noting the uses in which Jn differed from the non-Aramaic Synoptists. Since for Torrey the Synoptic Gospels are all either originally Aramaic or else greatly influenced by Aramaic, he would have to differ from Burney in all the cases where Burney's Aramaisms were secured by Burney's method.

This does not seem to indicate that the Semitisms of Jn are immediately apparent to a Semitist, and the opinion of Semitic scholars on the Greek of Jn and on Burney's view of

---

4 Cf.p.30f., where adequate parallels to Jn's use of this phrase are given from both classical and Hellenistic Greek.

it bears out this fact. Wellhausen's disbelief in the Semitic quality of Jn's Greek[5] has been alluded to before. Lagrange's dissent from various positions of Burney and Torrey has been noted; he would welcome Burney's theory if he could, but in general as well as in detail he concludes that Jn's Greek does not read like a translation from a Semitic original.[6] Gustav Dalman concludes that Burney has failed to prove that the Gospel of Jn had an Aramaic original.[7]

To give that convincing and final touch which the body of his argument lacked, Burney turned to the establishment of mistranslation. 28 mistranslations as suggested by Burney, Montgomery, or Torrey, have been studied in Chapter III: 15 of Burney's, 5 of Montgomery's, 8 of Torrey's. In not a single case do all three agree in picking the same passage. Torrey repudiates Burney's mistranslations <u>in toto</u>, so that it is not surprising to find him disagreeing with Burney as to the original Aramaic in the two instances in which they pick the same passage. Montgomery and Burney pick the same passage once, and give the same explanation for it. Montgomery and Torrey pick the same passage once, and disagree as to the original Aramaic, and Montgomery later disagrees with himself. These results have caused considerable scepticism as to the objectivity of the methods that

---

5 <u>Das Johannis Evangelium</u>, pp.145-146.
6 <u>S.Jean</u>, pp.cxvii.-cxix.
7 cf. his review in <u>Theologische Literaturzeitung</u> (1923,1), and <u>Jesus-Jeshua</u> (Eng. trans.), p.26.

produced them.[8]

The argument from the content of the Gospel has not been touched on here. The case of the Aramaists is singularly weak in this respect. Torrey has repudiated Burney's claims for the Jewish origin of the Logos doctrine and the mysticism of the Fourth Gospel.[9] The historical improbability of a Christian gospel written in Aramaic has been well stated by Professor E.J.Goodspeed.[10] In this phase of the argument, as in the linguistic, the Aramaists are hampered by the lack of contemporary Aramaic literature. Torrey's calm assumption that if an appreciable amount of contemporary Hebrew-Aramaic literature had been preserved, it would have presented many parallels to the thought of the Fourth Gospel, and that <u>therefore</u> it is not right to speak of its thought as un-Jewish, is merely a bold attempt to beg the question.

This study has often labored to establish as Greek, constructions whose right to be considered Greek would never be questioned among Greek scholars; the only justification for this emphasis on these elementary matters is that the Aramaists have evidently been ignorant of them. The contribution of this study to that cooperation of Greek and Aramaic scholars which is so often desiderated may consist in this very demonstration of the Greek nature of constructions which would be ignored as obviously Greek by Greek scholars

---

8 cf. McNeile, <u>Intro</u>., p.278.
9 cf.J.E.Carpenter's review of <u>ACFG</u>, <u>HJ</u> XXI 1923.
10 <u>New Solutions to N.T.Problems</u>,pp.65-77;cf. also

writing for those who know Greek.

This study should also raise some questions in the mind of the reader as to method in the study of "Semitisms" in the N.T., for that Burney's method can be justified after the facts presented here have been studied, seems incredible.

In conclusion, it may be well to reiterate the main points established: 1.There is an unbelievably wide amount of disagreement among the Semitic scholars in presuppositions, method, and results. 2.The great majority of the constructions which they attack are adequately paralleled in either literary or non-literary Greek or both. 3.The few "Semitisms" for which adequate parallels are not given in this study almost all occur in Christian writings composed in Greek, and are no more a proof of an Aramaic original in Jn than they are in Paul or Hermas. 4.The mistranslations advanced are not compelling, and serve rather to discredit than to recommend the argument of the Aramaists.

D.W.Riddle, "The So-called Jewish Christians," Anglican Theological Review (1929).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AJP: American Journal of Philology, Baltimore, 1880f.

AOFG: C.F.Burney, The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel, Oxford, 1922.

Abbott, cf. JG.

Allis, cf. PTR.

O.J.Baab, Character of the Greek Translation of the Book of Genesis, Diss. Chicago, 1928.

W.E.Barnes, A Review of Burney's work, JTS 23 (1922).

C.J.Ball, "Had the Fourth Gospel an Aramaic Archetype?" Expository Times, November 1909.

Bauer, Das Johannesevangelium, 2te Auflage, Tübingen, 1925.

-----, cf. Wörterbuch.

Bernard, St. John, New York, 1928.

G.N.Bernardakis, Plutarchi Moralia ii., Leipzig, 1889.

BD: Blass-Debrunner, Friedrich Blass' Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch, bearbeitet von A. Debrunner, 5te Auflage, Göttingen, 1921.

E.D.Burton, N.T.Moods and Tenses, 2d ed., Chicago 1893.

----------, Spirit, Soul, and Flesh, Chicago 1918.

BGU: Ägyptische Urkunden aus den königlichen (staatlichen) Museen zu Berlin: Griechische Urkunden i.-vii., Berlin 1895-1926.

C.F.Burney, cf. AOFG.

----------, "The Aramaic Equivalent of ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας in

Jn 7:38," JTS 24 (1922).

----------,"Hebraic Constructions in the Apocalypse," JTS 22 (1921).

M.Burrows, "The Johannine Prologue as Aramaic Verse," JBL 45 (1926).

H.J.Cadbury, "The Ancient Physiological Notions underlying Jn 1.13 and Hebrews xi.11," Expositor, December 1924.

----------, "Luke--Translator or Author?" AJT 24 (1920).

----------, "Lexical Notes on Luke-Acts I," JBL 44 (1925).

C.E.Carpenter, A review of Burney's work, Hibbert Journal 21 (1923).

Elizabeth Carter, The Moral Discourses of Epictetus, New York, 1926.

G.Dalman, A review of Burney's work, Theologische Literatur-Zeitung (1923,1).

---------, Jesus-Jeshua (Eng. trans.), New York, 1929.

---------, The Words of Jesus, Edinburgh, 1902.

A.Deissmann, Bible Studies, Edinburgh, 1901.

----------, Light from the Ancient East, 4th ed.,London, 1927.

K.Dick, Der Schriftstellerische Plural bei Paulus,Halle,1900.

G.R.Driver, A review of Burney's work, The Jewish Guardian, January 5,12, 1923.

H.L.Ebeling, in Gildersleeve Studies, Baltimore, 1902.

F.Field, Notes on the translation of the N.T.,Cambridge,1899.

E.J.Goodspeed, New Solutions of N.T.Problems, Chicago, 1927.

----------, Index Patristicus, Leipzig,1907.

W.W.Goodwin, Syntax of Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb,

Boston, 1890.

Greek Syntax: B.L.Gildersleeve, Syntax of Classical Greek i, ii, New York, 1900,1911.

W.R.Halliday, The Greek Questions of Plutarch, Oxford, 1928.

Hatch & Redpath, A Concordance to the Septuagint, Oxford,1897.

F.Hultsch, Die Erzählenden Zeitformen bei Polybios, Leipzig, 1891-1893.

JBL: Journal of Biblical Literature, New Haven, Conn.

JG: E.A.Abbott, Johannine Grammar, London, 1906.

Hist.Gram: A.N.Jannaris, An Historical Greek Grammar, London, 1897.

Kiecker, Die Stellung des Verbs im Griechischen, Strassburg, 1911.

KG: Kühner-Gerth, Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache, Satzlehre, by B.Gerth i,ii, 1898,1904.

K.Lake, The Apostolic Fathers, New York, 1924.

LS: Liddell & Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon, 8th ed., Oxford, 1901. A new edition by H.S.Jones, Oxford, 1925.

M.J.Lagrange, Evangile selon S.Marc, Paris, 1920.

----------, Evangile selon S.Jean, Paris, 1925.

George Long, The Discourses of Epictetus, translated with notes,etc., New York, (without date).

McNeile, An Introduction to the Study of the N.T., Oxford, 1927.

P.Melcher, De Sermone Epicteteo quibus rebus ab Attica regula discedat, Halle, 1906.

C.W.E.Miller, "The Imperfect and Aorist in Greek", AJP XVI 139f.

G.Milligan, St.Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians, London, 1908.

R.Mücke, "Zu Arrian's und Epiktets Sprachgebrauch," Jahresbericht ü. d. königliche Klosterschule zu Ilfeld, Nordhausen, 1887.

J.H.Moulton, cf. Prolog.

MH: Moulton and Howard, A Grammar of N.T.Greek, i,ii, Edinburgh, 1919-1929.

MM; Vocab.: Moulton and Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament illustrated from the Papyri and other non-literary sources, London, 1914f.

Moulton and Geden, Concordance to the Greek Testament, Edinburgh, 1897.

W.A.Oldfather, Epictetus...with an Eng.trans., New York, 1926.

Origin: James A.Montgomery, The Origin of the Gospel according to ST.John, Philadelphia, 1923.

James A.Montgomery, "Some Aramaisms in the Gospels and Acts," JBL 46 (1927).

P Fay: Fayum Towns and their Papyri, B.P.Grenfell, A.S.Hunt, and D.G.Hogarth, 1900.

P Lond: Greek Papyri in the British Museum, i-iii, F.G.Kenyon, London, 1893f.

P Oxy: Oxyrhynchus Papyri, vols.i-vi, edd.B.P.Grenfell, and A.S.Hunt; vols.vii-ix., ed. A.S.Hunt; vols.x-xvi, edd. B.P.Grenfell, A.S.Hunt, and H.I.Bell; vol.xvii, ed.

A.S.Hunt, London, 1898-1929.

P Teb: The Tebtunis Papyri, vol.ii, edd.B.P.Grenfell, A.S. Hunt, and E.J.Goodspeed, London, 1907.

Papyrusbriefe: Bror Olson, Papyrusbriefe aus der frdheste Römerzeit, Upsala, 1925.

Papyri Graecae Magicae, vol.i, ed. Karl Preisendanz, Leipzig, 1928.

Pallis, Notes on St.John and the Apocalypse, Oxford, (without date).

Pernot, cf. Revue.

PTR: O.T.Allis, "The Alleged Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel," Princeton Theological Review 26 (1928).

Radermacher, Neutestamentliche Grammatik, 2te Auflage, Tübingen, 1925.

Reitzenstein-Schader, Studien zum antiken Synkretismus aus Iran und Griechenland, Leipzig, 1926.

Review: C.C.Torrey, "The Aramaic Origin of the Gospel of John," Harvard Theological Review 16 (1923).

Revue: Pernot, A review of Burney's work, Revue des Etudes grecques 37 (Janvier-Mars 1924).

A.T.Robertson, "The Causal Use of ἵνα," in Studies in Early Christianity, ed. S.J.Case, New York, 1928.

H.B.Robinson, Syntax of the Participle in the Apostolic Fathers, Chicago, 1913.

Schenkl, Epictetus, Editio Maior, Leipzig, 1916.

Schlatter, Sprache und Heimat des vierten Evangelisten, Gütersloh, 1902.

Sharp, Epictetus and the N.T., London, 1914.

H.W.Smyth, A Greek Grammar for Schools and Colleges, New York, 1916.

H.B.Swete, Introduction to the O.T. in Greek, Cambridge,1914.

H.St.J.Thackeray, The Septuagint and Jewish Worship, London, 1922.

----------, Grammar of the O.T. in Greek, Cambridge, 1909.

A.Thumb, Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus, Strassburg, 1901.

WM: Winer-Moulton, Grammar of N.T. Greek, 9th Eng. ed., Edinburgh, 1882.

J.Wellhausen, Das Johannis Evangelium, Berlin, 1908.

----------, Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien, 2te Auflage, Berlin, 1911.

H.Windisch, "Die Verstockungsidee in Mc 4:12 und das kausale ἵνα der späteren Koine," ZNTW 26 (1927).